

Home

The
VISION
OF THE
EVENING AND THE MORNING

A Study of the Prophecy of
Daniel VIII.

BY
JOHN KOLVOORD
AND
MOSES E. KELLOGG

"And the vision of the evening and the morning which
was told is true."—*Daniel viii. 26.*

BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN

The
VISION
OF THE
EVENING AND THE MORNING

A Study of the Prophecy of
Daniel VIII.

BY
JOHN KOLVOORD
AND
MOSES E. KELLOGG

“And the vision of the evening and the morning which
was told is true.”—*Daniel viii. 26.*

BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN

BS
1556
.K6
HER.

222054

PREFACE

ABOUT three years ago, the two authors of this treatise meeting one day, one asked the other this question: "What are you studying now?" The reply was, "I am studying the subject of the Sanctuary." The first speaker responded, "So am I." By further conversation it was found that both were in doubt as to the correctness of their former views upon this subject, and that both were seeking for the correct solution of the prophecy of Daniel VIII.

As one of these persons lived in the country and the other in town, and as the one who lived in town was away from home much of the time, they could not collaborate in their studies, but carried them on independently, though they sometimes met and compared ideas and conclusions. Finally each wrote out what seemed to him to be the truth in the matter. What they wrote composes the two parts of this treatise. It has been thought best to publish them in one, that in the mouth of two witnesses, at least, every word may be established.

The reader will notice that while there is a remarkable agreement in the views of the two authors, there is a striking dissimilarity in the *way* the subject is discussed. The matter presented by one is as an essay without much reference to the hopes built upon this prophecy by the Adventists; the other writes with special emphasis as to what Adventists believe, and in an

apologetic tone, of their mistakes. One devotes much space to the specifications of the prophecy relating to the Syrian king, Antiochus Epiphanes, the other to the pollution and subsequent cleansing of the sanctuary. Each part, therefore, seems to supplement the other, which, it is believed, makes the whole more interesting and will stimulate a thorough study of the same.

The ideas here set forth will also explain in part the reason of my silence for some years. When I became thoroughly convinced that as one of its central doctrines the Seventh-day Adventist church was holding to and striving to perpetuate a gross error, I could no longer be a party to it, much less be enthusiastic in support of the church. I was forced by the inexorable logic of facts to dissent; and this treatise is submitted as evidence that I have good grounds for so doing. Error leads only to bondage; the truth alone makes one free. And we should not hesitate to accept truth, even if in so doing we are compelled to acknowledge that we have been in error. I firmly believe that herein is presented the absolute truth upon the subject considered, and the truth needs no apology, though it does sometimes, as in this case, need a defender.

And now "with charity toward all, and malice toward none, with firmness in the right as God gives me to see the right," I lay these evidences of the truth of my contention in this matter upon the heart and conscience of all to whom this work may come, pray-

ing ever that the Holy Spirit who is to guide us into all truth, may direct the reader in his study and decisions upon this important subject.

Oct. 1, 1907.

MOSES E. KELLOGG.

348 Van Buren St.,
Battle Creek, Mich.

This treatise will be sent postpaid to any person in the United States or Canada upon receipt of 25 cents.

THE PROPHECY OF DANIEL VIII

BY JOHN KOLVOORD

PART I

EVERY true prediction eventually becomes a historic reality. This statement is self-evident to all who know that prophecy differs from history only in point of time: the one is written before, while the other is written after, the events have transpired. For this reason predicted history, taken in its strictest sense, is not a counterpart of prophecy in its being similar to it as a whole, or in bearing resemblance in some important respect. The relation between them does not consist in correspondence or similarity, but in actual identity as to outlines and particular details. Such history is as much a duplicate of prophecy as a carbon copy corresponds with its typewritten upper sheet. To all intents and purposes, this duplicate corresponds with the original, contains the same provisions, and is governed by the same restrictions.

The Messiah delineated by the ancient seers answers exactly to the historical Saviour of apostolic times. Of this proof Jesus availed himself to convince his despairing disciples. The record says, "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Reviewing the various incidents of his history, he pointed out how each had been minutely foretold. The disciples accordingly,

from that time on, saw the identity between the minutest details of his life in prophecy and in history. Thenceforward they read the fulfilment of events in "that which was spoken by the prophets." And for this reason the gospels abound in such utterances as these: "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken;" "and the scripture was fulfilled, which saith;" "these things were done that the scripture should be fulfilled;" "and again another scripture saith," etc.

Agreeable to this principle, all the data, taken collectively, constitute the full outline of a particular prophècy. Perhaps a few of its delineations may very appropriately be applied to other events, just as a few random strokes may serve as the general outline for many a portrait. But when the artist develops his sketch by bringing out the peculiar and characteristic delineations, it is only then that the sketch assumes individuality. And even at that stage a stroke added here, or a very little change made there, transforms the subject into an entirely different personality.

These principles should be borne in mind when attempting to explain prophecy; for a failure to comply with this requirement results inevitably in misapplication. Absolute identification should be sought. And having succeeded in proving the identity of the outlines of a given prophecy with the salient features of a historic personality or event, we shall then have found both the original and its duplicate. The one will fit the other as exactly as a casting fits its mold.

Having briefly outlined the principle on which we planned to conduct the investigation, we commence, without further preliminaries, to test the correctness of an accepted interpretation of the sanctuary and the 2,300 days of Dan. 8:13, 14. This study being, in the first place, a test of the quite widely accepted explanation, will have to be prosecuted along two lines—the one negatively and the other constructively. We do not intend to take away without giving something better instead. To this the unbiased reader, who desires truth above anything else, can have no objection. Error may be fondled, may be regarded invulnerable to sound criticism, yea, may be defended to the last ditch, yet truth, though crushed to earth, will rise again; “the eternal years of God are hers.”

In the symbolic representation of Daniel 8, a ram and a he-goat served respectively as representatives of the Medo-Persian and the Grecian empires. Now, note well that each animal symbolizes a government, but the horns convey different ideas. Those of the ram suggest that the government is a double power composed of the union of two kingdoms. Yet the two form but one empire represented by the ram. Grecia, another empire, has a notable horn, and that horn also does not represent the empire, but Greece's first king only; for the shaggy goat itself was explained to represent the “king” (kingdom) of Greece. Verse 21.

Similarly in Daniel 7, the nondescript beast is pictured as having ten horns. The animal is interpreted

to be a portrait of the third universal kingdom, after Babylon. In verse 24, "the ten horns out of this kingdom" are said to be "ten kings that shall arise." Hence, when Rome was finally divided, the resulting kingdoms perpetuating Roman civilization, language, and laws, were Roman still. And the little horn, coming up among the ten, though diverse from them all, is Romish notwithstanding. All this follows logically, because the beast wearing the horns represents Rome.

The principal question to be settled first is the meaning of the animal. The horns are secondary symbols, representing either the supreme authority of a single monarch, or the kingdoms resulting from the division of the empire. In the case under consideration, the "kingdom" of Greece had a notable horn, which was plainly explained to represent a single king. After his death, the unity of the monarchy was broken into four divisions, as is represented by the four horns. And each of those four horns represents a kingdom over which a dynasty, or a succession of kings, bore rule. Their political nationality is determined by the animal bearing the horns. Relying upon the soundness of this premise, we predicate that the horns of a ram are ram's horns; the horns of a goat are goat's horns; and the horns of a Roman beast are Roman horns. In the symbolism of Scripture we do not find the anomaly of a Roman horn growing out of a goat's horn. Yet we are asked to believe that the little horn, which sprang out of one

of the horns of the he-goat, was ^{the} then Roman power!

Illustrating the basic principles enunciated, the following corroborative testimony, we think, will settle the question conclusively. In the preceding chapter, the Grecian empire is not represented by a goat with four horns, but by a winged leopard having four heads. Beginning at this point, the symbols represent an absolute identity: the horns and the heads denote the four divisions of the empire. By parity of reasoning, let us now assume that something grew out of one of those heads, just as the little horn came forth out of one of the horns. Would not the bone, flesh, or horn growing out of the head be regarded as a part of the animal, inasmuch as the leopard's blood caused it to grow? Would any sane person, seeing such an outgrowth, think of calling it the beginning of another animal? Could the thing grow, if severed from the head? Or could the thing live and grow after the leopard died? These questions are easily answered; likewise as regards the little horn. It could grow only so long as the goat's blood furnished the increment. The goat could fight with it, but it could not fight against the goat and overcome him. If it was a formidable horn, it was that on account of the strength of the goat pushing it. To believe the opposite is to believe a palpable absurdity. Yet such an absurdity is advocated by those who teach that the horn (Rome) conquered the beast (Greece) out of which it came forth.

Neither was the Roman empire a continuation of

the universal dominion established by Alexander, which it would have been had it sprung from the Macedonian horn. Rome existed, as an independent power, long before the Grecian empire wielded its sway over the Orient. There is just as good reason for claiming that the Grecian dominion came in through Medo-Persia, and the Medo-Persian through Babylon, as there is for Rome coming in through the Macedonian horn. When Rome had subjugated the Macedonian kingdom, the he-goat had one horn broken off, but he still lived and fought with three horns. And if Rome was a part of that lost horn, then the empire lost both the horn and the little one coming out of it. Logically then, Greece rid herself of Rome when she lost Macedonia. Thus their argument contradicts itself.

In each panoramic representation of prophecy, the vanishing governments are succeeded either by different animals or by different metals. We challenge a single instance where a distinctly foreign power is represented as issuing out of any part of a vanquished beast. It is, therefore, anomalous and absurd to attribute to Rome what distinctly belongs to one of the horns of Greece.

The theory assailed also runs counter to the plain specifications enumerated in the prophecy. There is no intimation of one of the four horns being destroyed by the little horn. According to a positive declaration of the one who was commissioned to explain the prophecy, the four horns represented the

four kingdoms into which the Greek dominion would be divided. Verse 22. The nation continues to be the goat nation, for from this time on a four-horned goat serves as symbol. While the goat had one horn, the executive authority was vested in one king. This idea is plainly expressed in these words: "And the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king." Verse 21. After its division, the empire was ruled by four contemporaneous kings. And as the kingdoms outlasted the lives of several sovereigns, a succession of kings ruled over each. Accordingly, "in the latter time of their kingdom"—*i. e.*, in the latter part of the rule of those four contemporaneous dynasties—"a king . . . shall stand up." Verse 23. The little horn was thus plainly explained to represent *a king*. The horn out of which it sprang typified the whole line of kings, and also, by metonymy, their kingdom. The little one which was seen issuing from the large horn was one of the kings composing the dynasty. Differently expressed, the horn together with its outgrowth constituted the kingdom, or line of kings. The little horn denoted one king of that line, the rest of the dynasty being represented by the large horn. Horn and little horn were a unit, and not two horns. This horn had a process, prong, or branch.

As everything depends upon the soundness of the premise, let us make assurance doubly sure by looking at this matter from still another point of view. The eleventh of Daniel contains a fuller and plainer explanation of the symbols of chapter eight. After

Cyrus, thus said the angel, four more kings would rule over Medo-Persia. The last and richest king would "stir up all against the realm of Grecia," but be beaten by a mighty king. The kingdom of this mighty conqueror was next to be broken, and divided "toward the four winds of heaven." The government, it is also explicitly stated, should not descend to his posterity, seeing it was to be given "to others than those." This interpretation is exactly in harmony with the visions of the four heads and the four horns. Next notice that the subsequent part of the explanation drops two of the four kingdoms and proceeds to tell very minutely what was done by "the king of the north" and "the king of the south." The word *king*, as here used, covers the whole line of Ptolemies on the one hand, and the Seleucid dynasty on the other. But the Macedonian kingdom is not even mentioned, which omission is a significant fact, if it be true that the little horn made its entrance through Macedonia, as has been assumed, and that the Macedonian horn, therefore, constitutes the pivotal idea of the prophecy.

Following this line of investigation a little farther, we find exactly the same things imputed to one of the kings of the north which were charged against the little horn. The king who is called "a vile person," in verse 21, should come in contact with the people of God, pollute the sanctuary, take away the daily sacrifice, and place the abomination of desolation. These specifications agree wholly with those of the little horn. From which facts no other conclusion

can legitimately be drawn than that the little horn constituted a part of the Seleucid horn of the goat. As was affirmed before, it also proves the unity of the horn and the little horn, for the "vile" king comes in the regular succession of the Seleucid kings. He was in no other sense, than in his special deeds, distinct from them. He made himself conspicuous by his attitude and his actions, wherefore he is represented as an awry-grown part of the horn. In no better way could the attention be drawn to his outrageous deeds.

Having proved that the little horn could not possibly come in by way of the Macedonian horn, the inconsistency of the theory can now be further laid bare by instituting an inquiry into what it was to do, when that would be done, how much time was allotted to the performance, besides who and what suffered in consequence. There is as gross a misapprehension, or rather misapplication, of these prophetic specifications as there is of the fundamental meaning of the symbol. The erroneous interpretation of the symbol led to a forced and unnatural explanation of what was done. Let us apply the specifications to Rome, and note the incompatibilities.

The little horn was to tread the sanctuary and the host under foot, during a period of 2,300 days. Assuming the days to represent as many years, the end of the time of oppression can definitely be determined by a simple arithmetical calculation; for, according to the specification of the prophecy, the little horn

does it without assistance. Being therefore restricted by this consideration, the period of 2,300 years can not begin prior to the year 161 B. C., when Rome first came in contact with the people of God. Hence the 2,300 years, though crowded back to their utmost limit (161 B. C.), will not expire before the year 2139 A. D. And that spoils the theory.

Furthermore, the little horn was to tread under foot *both* the host and the sanctuary. Harmonious with this specification, it will be impossible to prove that Rome did, and yet will, oppress either Jews or Christians until the allotted time is full. And as regards the treading under foot of a sanctuary that does not now exist, this problem is beyond comprehension. But an expedient to circumvent this embarrassing difficulty has been sagaciously invented. Elder J. N. Andrews stated the matter thus: "The fact is plain, then, that of the vision of 2,300 days concerning the sanctuary, only 490 pertained to the earthly sanctuary; and also that the iniquity of the Jewish people would in that period be so far filled up that God would leave them, and the city and the sanctuary would soon after be destroyed, and never be rebuilt, but left in ruins till the consummation. . . . It is therefore an established fact that the worldly sanctuary of the first covenant, and the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant, are both embraced in the vision of the 2,300 days."—*The Sanctuary and the Twenty-Three Hundred Days.*

In accordance with the aforesaid view, the tread-

ing under foot of the earthly sanctuary began in the year 457 B. C.; *but it is not explained how the little horn could begin its work 296 years before it even came in contact with the Jews.* Or if we are asked to believe that the Persians commenced the atrocious deed in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, then we inquire how the theory can be harmonized with the following decree of Darius, and endorsed by Artaxerxes, in which it is said, “And the God that caused his name to dwell there destroy all kings and people, that shall put to their hand *to alter and to destroy this house of God which is at Jerusalem.*” As a matter of fact, neither Persians, Grecians, nor Romans caused Israel very much molestation in their belief or worship. Neither did any of them bear a grudge in particular against the sanctuary. This point will become plainer as we proceed.

Notwithstanding, let the assumption be admitted that the sanctuary was defiled for 490 years; on the ground of what specification in the prophecy, then, are we permitted to conclude, that the treading under foot applies to two sanctuaries, the one earthly and the other heavenly? And since the heavenly one was not trodden literally under foot, how can one be answered who insists that the Jewish sanctuary was likewise trodden figuratively under foot by the gentiles? Moreover, since the figurative treading under foot applies to *both* the people and the sanctuary, prove it, who can, that the people suffered hardship. Inflict a figurative punishment upon the people—“but

that would hurt nobody!" Exactly. Neither can a figurative treading under foot affect an earthly or a heavenly sanctuary. Either is desecrated only by actual contact, or by having sins transferred to it. But transferring sins is not treading the sanctuary under foot. If it were, then the 2,300 days would date back to the days of wandering in the wilderness. The sanctuary alluded to in the prophecy had to be cleansed from being defiled by something called an abomination, as well as from having been trampled under foot. Thus it is plainly specified.

Taking it again on the believed premise, another important consideration is overlooked. During the 490 years Israel's sanctuary was cleansed annually, with but three exceptions. As ceremonial performances, those sanctifications were as really effective as any others made previous to the period of seventy weeks. By those acts the sanctuary was hallowed from uncleanness (Leviticus 16). Whoever reflects upon this will perceive, that neither real nor fancied defilement from any source can be imputed to a sanctuary which has been cleansed. To claim sanctification for a sanctuary still reeking with defilement from any other than Israel's sins, is as contradictory as it is inane. Up to the last atonement preceding the rending of the vail, the sanctuary stood cleansed from any and all uncleanness.

We quote again: "The fact is plain, then, that of the vision of 2,300 days concerning the sanctuary, only 490 pertained to the earthly sanctuary."—J. N.

Andrews. The fact is still plainer that the temple, being annually purified, no further uncleanness can be imputed to it. Hence the argument does not apply to 490 of the 2,300 years.

The theory respecting the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is equally inconsistent with the requirements of the type. For, while the high priest performed the cleansing work, no one was permitted to enter the temple. Lev. 16:17. During that interim there were no sacrifices for sins. Accordingly, the more satisfactorily it is proved to one's liking that the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary began in 1844, so much the more positively the end of probation is fixed on that date. If Christ then began his change of ministration from priest to highpriest, confession of sins has ever since been in vain. But the thousands who have received forgiveness during the last sixty years, constitute as many separate proofs that the cleansing work has not yet begun. The time is still future when no one will be able, like in the type, to enter the heavenly sanctuary, for that will be after the seven angels have received the vials full of God's wrath. Rev. 15:5-8. Hence, 1844 fails to connect with the time of cleansing. It is separated by an ever-widening chasm of already more than six decades. Prophecy is not fulfilled so discrepantly. If events do not synchronize exactly with the chronology of the prophecy, there is assuredly no connection between them.

Furthermore, there are alleged to be "two oppos-

ing sanctuaries in Daniel 8. To the careful reader this fact will at once appear. They are as follows: First, the sanctuary of the daily desolation. Second, the sanctuary which the daily and the transgression of desolation were to tread under foot. The one is the sanctuary of Satan; the other is the sanctuary of the Lord of hosts."—*Andrews*. Two opposing sanctuaries plus the Jewish one make three sanctuaries. All of them are embodied in a single word! That word *sanctuary* is surely pregnant with meaning, for it is made to cover every degree of worship in heaven above, the earth below, even down to the homage paid to Satan. Whoever discovered those three in one must have been a great discoverer of hidden things.

An elaborate argument is also built upon the literal meaning of the word *determined*. "Seventy weeks," so says the original, "are cut off upon thy people." Very well, take the expression just as it reads. The period was cut off from something. From what? "From the 2,300 days," it is said. The conclusion is gratuitous. The period can just as consistently be cut off from all subsequent time, as from any limited portion. In Job 14: 5 man's days are said to be "determined." Can this expression have no sensible meaning, unless we fancy them as being cut out of some definitely limited period in the sight of God, who sees the end from the beginning, man lives an allotted length of time; his days are determined, or carved out, without reference to any other event. In

the same sense God allotted 490 years, at whose expiration Israel's peculiar relationship came to an end.

In the next place much reliance is placed upon the allegation that the accepted translation of Dan. 8:13 is incorrect. In "Thoughts on Daniel" it is said, "We have proof in verse 13 that *sacrifice* is the wrong word to be supplied in connection with the word *daily*. . . . The idea of sacrifice does not attach to the word at all. . . . Literally, it may be rendered, 'How long the vision [concerning] the continuance and the transgression of desolation?'"

Had the author of the aforesaid criticism been on less than on the most distant of "speaking terms" with the Hebrew language, he would undoubtedly have amended his emendation of the text. The writer of this knows barely enough of that language to cover the simplest rudiments, nevertheless he can, by the help of a lexicon, trace the connection between "continual" and "sacrifice." Therefore, to disprove the assertion that the idea of sacrifice does not at all attach to the word *continual*, we shall let a Hebrew lexicon decide. Turning to the word *tameed*, we copy the following definition in full: "Continuance, *olah tameed* burnt-offering of continuance, *i. e.*, continual or daily burnt-offering, Num. 28:6, so also in apposition *olath tameed*, Num. 28:3; but also without *olath*, *e. g.*, *hottameed wehaysiroo* and they shall put away the constant offering, Dan. 11:31. (2) as adv. continually, ever."—*Davies' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*.

At the institution of the morning and the evening sacrifice, Moses was instructed to offer "two lambs of the first year day by day *continually*." Ex. 29: 38-46. For this reason it is not far-fetched to call the daily sacrifice the offering of continuance. The Jews of later times called the daily sacrifice simply the "daily," just as we are accustomed to such expressions as reading "dailies" when riding on a "daily." Such expressions are linguistic peculiarities. And Bevan, when writing on the linguistic character of Daniel, cites the very point under consideration, as an illustration. He says: "*Hottameed*, Dan. 8:11, 13; 11:31; 12:11. Other Biblical writers call the daily burnt-offering *olah hottameed* (Num. 28:10ff, Neh. 10:34), but in Daniel the simple *hottameed* is used instead—so also in the Mishna (*e. g.*, Ta'aneeth iv. 6)." The Mishna, comprising the "Oral Law," forms a kind of complement to the written law, which it explains and amplifies. This proves how the Jews understood the expression. In the light of such authorities, "the continuance and the transgression of desolation" is to be regarded as a veritable barbarism. It is meaningless and absurd.

But, "the grand principle involved in the interpretation of the 2,300 days of Dan. 8:14 is, that the seventy weeks of Dan. 9:24 are the first 490 days of the 2,300, of the eighth chapter." The crucial test is, then, to be applied at this point. If the logic can be proved to be fallacious, the system, and with it the theory of the sanctuary, must fall. We shall conduct

this investigation first along the illogical lines of reasoning, and afterwards disprove those premises by historical evidence.

The aforementioned "grand principle" is based upon the hypothesis that the period of 2,300 days was not explained to Daniel, in chapter eight. The failure can consist only in not naming its duration, its initial, or its terminal point. The subject under consideration is the taking away of the daily sacrifice, the casting down of the place of the sanctuary, and the treading under foot of sanctuary and host. In reply to the query, as worded in verse 13, and covering the time when said specifications were to become events, the answer was given: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days." This is unequivocal; there can be no mistaking the *length* of the period. And what should happen at its *close*? "Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The taking away of the daily sacrifice and the setting up of the abomination constitute, then, the *beginning* of the period. This is simple enough for an ordinary child to grasp. Time is not the item that could have perplexed Daniel.

Chapters 10 and 11 are devoted to a plainer and more detailed explanation of the vision. According to verse 14, the angel said, "Now am I come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days." The Jews are here named "thy people." In chapter 9 it is likewise said, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people." The vision, then, deals with what

would befall *Israel* in the "latter days." This expression, and also "the time of the end," does not mean the end of time. It is a prophetic phrase denoting the time of fulfilment. It is what the prophet sees at the horizon of his vision. Similarly, Jacob foretold what would happen to his posterity "in the last days"—events fulfilled in Palestine. Balaam said to Balak, "And now, behold, I go unto my people: come therefore, and I will advertise thee what this people shall do to thy people in the latter days." Num. 24:14. This, also, has happened long ago.

Chapter 10 is introductory. In chapter 11 the explanation given is so complete an expansion of chapter 8 that one needs but insert the names of men and countries to make the prophecy read like history. That explanation was needed to make the vision fully intelligible. Those who lived in the days of its accomplishment could not mistake the meaning. Yet, notwithstanding the extreme minuteness in details, nothing was said about the days, simply because that part of the vision is self-explanatory.

Whether there is a connection between Daniel 8 and 9, we shall, for argument's sake, neither admit nor deny. We present what seems to us as a more reasonable view. The preceding vision, or visions, taken in connection with Jeremiah's prophecies, which Daniel had just been studying, may have given him wrong views respecting Israel's future. Daniel prayed earnestly for what he hoped and expected to see established after the captivity was ended. In this connec-

tion Gabriel gave him plainly to understand, that Israel's expected salvation would not come at the close of the captivity. After that another seventy weeks of years had to elapse before Messiah would come. Then the sanctuary and its service, in which he was so exceedingly much interested, would have served their purpose in the middle of the seventieth week. Also, after that the city would again be destroyed. In thought and scope, chapter 9 differs widely from the preceding vision.

"At the beginning of thy supplications," said Gabriel, "the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision." Dan. 9:23. As soon as Daniel began to unburden his mind, the command was given to give him skill and understanding. If this is an allusion to the vision of chapter 8, then Gabriel did not succeed in giving him skill and understanding, for he explained that vision very minutely at a subsequent time, as has been pointed out. But if the vision alluded to in chapter 9, be limited to the matter which was revealed at that particular time, then the difficulty vanishes.

A careful comparison reveals, furthermore, that the two periods are opposites. The 2,300 days are a period of desolation, of oppression, and of defiling the sanctuary. The 490 years begin with restoration, with a rebuilding of city and temple, and a resumption of the sanctuary service. The people were not oppressed, but found favor in the sight of heathen

monarchs. By decree, the privilege was granted them of drawing from the provincial treasury of Syria, to the amount of whatever was required for the service of the temple, to the end that the priests might daily pray for the health of the king and the prosperity of his empire. The seventy weeks began in a manner the very opposite of the 2,300 days. Hence they did not begin simultaneously.

The next noteworthy discrepancy is caused by not discriminating between the two abominations. The "transgression of desolation," spoken of in chapter 8, lasted the full period of 2,300 days, at the end of which the sanctuary *was cleansed*. The "overspreading of abominations," mentioned in chapter 9, came at the destruction of Jerusalem. By it both city and temple were destroyed, making a subsequent cleansing of the temple impossible. It is, therefore, an incontrovertible fact that the period of 2,300 days, at the end of which the temple was cleansed, falls *prior to the destruction* of Jerusalem.

To the intent that the untenableness of the theory may become still more apparent, we shall next furnish proof contradicting the assumption that the "transgression of desolation" denotes the papacy. The matter referred to, under the appellation of "abomination of desolation," or "transgression of desolation," wherever the expression occurs in the Bible, does not denote people or individuals, but things. For, when Jesus alluded to the abomination of desolation, in connection with Jerusalem's overthrow, he surely did

not mean that the Christians should flee as soon as they saw the papacy established in the city. Neither is the expression a synonym for the Roman army, although Luke 21:20 seems to favor such a view. The sign mentioned by Luke applies more particularly to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The ones who were then in the midst of it, were warned to depart, and those in the country were cautioned not to enter the city. Matthew and Mark mention the abomination, and both give its meaning only as applicable to all Judea: "then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains."

Now notice more particularly that it is a *thing*. "And they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." Dan. 11:31. It is something placed: whoever took the sacrifice away, placed the abomination. Fausset defines it: "The idol of the desolator," or "the idol that causeth desolation." In "The Jewish Encyclopedia" the following definition is given: "In both Biblical and rabbinical Hebrew abomination is a familiar term for an idol (1 Kings 11:5; 2 Kings 23:13) . . . and therefore may well have the same application in Daniel, which should accordingly be rendered, in agreement with Ezra 9:3, 4, 'motionless abomination,' or, also, 'appalling abomination!'" And in James Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" the reader will find: "It is remarkable that in 1 Mac. 1:54 the idol-altar

is called by exactly the same name that is used in the book of Daniel."

The idolatrous, image-crowned Roman standards were symbols of heathen deities. To them the soldiers paid homage, and offered sacrifices in acknowledgment of victories obtained. When the legions, bearing those idol-standards, were seen, it was a warning to the inhabitants of Judea to flee to the mountains. All Jewry being familiar with the meaning of Christ's quotation, the Christians must have recognized in it, at once, an allusion to idols, or to idol-worship. The force of this statement will be better felt, if it be borne in mind that the Jews had annually, for *nearly* two hundred years, celebrated the Feast of Dedication (John 10:20), in commemoration of the cleansing of the second temple and altar, after they had been profaned by Antiochus Epiphanes. Consequently, the allusion to the abomination of desolation, spoken of in Daniel, suggested to them the idea of idols and idolatry. And harmonious with this is the marginal reading of Daniel 9:27, in the A. V., which says, "And upon the battlements shall be the idols of the desolator." Therefore, when the inhabitants of Judea saw idols brought within their borders, it was a sign of the impending desolation.

Nor can the 2,300 days be made to begin at the *end* of the 490 years, for a few years thereafter the sanctuary was destroyed, never to be rebuilt. Then the descendants of Israel were scattered to every point of the compass. In every particular, in short, the two

periods, laid side by side, are a mismatch. There is a misfit, because the prophecies of Daniel 8 and 9 pertain to wholly different events.

The explanation is also wrong as regards the participating agents. If the little horn represents Rome (and it certainly could not harm God's people before it came in contact with them, in 161 B. C.), then, according to the logic of the premise, the 2,300 days began to be fulfilled under people who were not Romans. For at the commencement of the weeks of years,—about three centuries before the Romans appeared upon the stage of action,—the Medes and Persians held supremacy over the Israelites. After them the Greeks held dominion, until they in turn were vanquished by the Romans. The whole theory of the periods beginning at the same starting point is a failure in every particular.

Here we call a halt. We shall stop chasing the fanciful. Not because there are no more glaring inconsistencies to be pointed out, but because those already mentioned must appeal strongly to thinking minds, and have awakened a longing for a more rational explanation of the subject. And let the reader be judge whether the following interpretation is not simpler, plainer, and exactly in harmony with events as foreshadowed by the outline of prophecy.

PART II

In the symbolism of chapter eight, the two contending governments are represented by the appropriate figures of a ram and a he-goat. There lies a significant meaning in this representation. Instead of a diadem, the kings of Persia wore a jeweled ram's head of gold, such as are seen on the pillars at Persepolis. Also, the Hebrew for *ram* springs from the same root as Elam, or Persia (*Newton*). And in Grecian mythology Ceranus, Macedonia's first king, is said to have been advised by an oracle to follow a flock of goats to where they stopped. They led him to Edessa, which he made the seat of his kingdom, and was called Ægæ, the goats' city. Its people were likewise called Ægædæ, or goats' people.

The prophetic symbols were, therefore, chosen with due appropriateness, and correctly applied to Medo-Persia and Grecia. Verses 20, 21. Proceeding with the last-named power, the conspicuous horn of the goat was interpreted to represent Greece's first king. Verse 21. Obviously not the first king of the line that ruled over the realm, but the first one of those who, after the overthrow of Persia, thenceforward bore sway, and ruled until the overturning of the four divisions of the Grecian empire. With panoramic vividness, we behold the last struggle waged in defense of Persia's supremacy. The victor who triumphed in that fierce conflict was Alexander the Great. He was, therefore, that great and notable horn.

Briefly noticing but a few of the more salient features, we next stop to consider that the great horn was broken just when the goat had become strong. The empire was in full strength at Alexander's death. One would expect to see that colossal strength perpetuated, but prophecy indicates a different turn of affairs. Four notable horns sprang up in the place of the one broken off. "Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his [the first king, Alexander's] power." Verse 22. This is the comment of him who was commanded to make Daniel understand the vision. The correctness of this interpretation, thus far, is firmly established.

By the help of history, we find the names of Alexander's four successors to be Seleucus, Cassander, Ptolemy, and Lysimachus. In this fourfold division the empire continued to exist, until it eventually was forced to bow before the scepter of Roman supremacy. With this brief allusion to the four Grecian kingdoms, they would be dismissed from further notice, had it not been distinctly foretold that "in the latter time of their kingdom," a "little horn" was to come forth.

Now note carefully what is said. The beginning of their kingdom dates from the battle of Ipsus (301 B. C.). The history of the kingdom allotted to Cassander terminated in the year 146 B. C. The kingdom of the Seleucidæ, comprising Syria, ended in the year 64 B. C. The rule over Egypt, under the Ptole-

mies, lasted till 30 B. C. And the government over Thrace ended with the fall of the Macedonian kingdom, in 168 B. C. According to these dates, the four kingdoms continued to rule, as contemporary kings, from 301 B. C. until 168 B. C. "In the latter time of their kingdom" means, accordingly, at some time previous to the end of their contemporaneous rule. The limitation set by the prophecy calls for the appearance of the little horn a short time prior to 168 B. C.

Having located the time when, note next out of what that horn issues. "Out of one of them," namely, one of the aforementioned horns. It is not an independent horn arising among the four existing horns, but it is an excrescence, a prong, if you please, something growing out of one of the four horns. The animal, be it remembered, is the goat. At this stage of the history, that goat bears four horns, each of which represents a division of the Grecian empire. If the argument is incontrovertible thus far, it follows logically that the little horn, growing out of one of the existing horns, belongs to the goat also. Therefore the "king of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences" was a Grecian king.

The little horn can not possibly mean Rome; this fact is nailed and clinched. Then to which one of the kings of Greece does the specification apply? Evidently to one of the Syrian division, for they bore rule over Israel. And who of them held the reins of government "in the latter part" of the contemporaneous reign of the four kings? Antiochus Epipha-

nes. This is not a latter-day discovery, for it was already so understood a century and a half before Christ. The proof will be furnished. We say it unhesitatingly that the prophecy applies to Antiochus, notwithstanding some one has said that "he does not fulfill the specifications in one single particular." This makes it an easy task to disprove the bald assertion, for the points of identity can very easily be established:

1. The little horn sprang out of one of the Grecian horns. Antiochus was one of the Seleucid kings.

2. He was to appear a little prior to 168 B. C. Antiochus Epiphanes reigned from 175 to 164 B. C.

3. He is called a "little horn." Bevan says that the Hebrew expression for *little* is generally supposed to mean "from smallness," or "out of smallness," hence "little." Little is, therefore, used in a derivative sense. Concurrent with this is the definition given in Davies' "Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon": "From smallness, *i. e.*, prob. from small beginnings." Antiochus rose indeed "out of smallness." In his youth he was held a hostage in Rome. Can it be as easily proved that the Roman power was but a little horn when Macedon was conquered in the year 168 B. C.? Rome had then already been rising steadily for almost six centuries, and for generations had coped successfully with neighboring powers. At the time the Macedonian horn was broken off by the Roman legions, the power of Rome was much more potent, and her dominion far more extensive than that of Mace-

don. Conformably, it would have been appropriate to say that a large horn arose out of a small one, provided it would be proper to represent a victorious foreign power by a horn, and not by another beast.

4. He "waxed exceeding great." Because his greatness was not equal to any of the previous world-powers, therefore the specification is deemed to be inapplicable to Antiochus. In taking this view, a comparison with other powers is assumed. But the prophecy does not limit us to such a comparison. Antiochus himself, compared with his erstwhile humble station in life, the subsequent investment with regal power, as well as by the thereafter successfully waged campaigns, became exceedingly great. This is in agreement with the primary meaning of "little": "out of smallness" he became exceedingly great.

5. The next point of coincidence is the exact direction in which his conquests lay, viz., "toward the south and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." He undertook four campaigns against Egypt, with greater success than had any of his predecessors.—*Fausset*. 1 Mac. 3:31, 37; 6:1. And Palestine, the pleasant land, suffered most terribly under his conquests. 1 Mac. 1:21. Rome, on the other hand, waxed great to the north, the south, the east, *and the west*. Its greatest strength lay in its western hordes. To it the application is not literal.

6. "In the latter time of their [the four horns] kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full." Verse 23. Hitzig and Von Lengerke render

the clause thus: "When the sinners fill up their measure." The sinners alluded to are undoubtedly the renegade Jews who were contemporaries with Antiochus. The following historical facts, gleaned from "Post-Biblical History of the Jews," will elucidate the text:

"The Jews of that period were enchanted with the ease and freedom of the Grecian mode of life, and restive under many of the restraints and limitations of their own. Accordingly, they abandoned themselves with all the frenzy of a new excitement, from which all restraint had been withdrawn, to the license which was offered to them. The exercises of the gymnasium seem to have taken hold of their minds with the force of a fascination. The priests neglected their service at the temple to be present at those spectacles. Some of the exercises were performed naked; and it is related that many of the Jewish competitors found means to obliterate the peculiar stamp of their nationality, in order that they might not be distinguished from Greeks and other champions in the sports of the gymnasium.

"A ferment of innovation in the minds of the Judeans at that time was not unlike that which, some two thousand years later, agitated the continent of Europe after the spread of the French Revolution and its doctrines. A new and foreign standard of perfection was set up: whatever was Greek was elegant, and beautiful, and desirable; whatever was not Greek, or opposed to its predominance, was superannuated, big-

oted, contemptible. Even minds sincerely attached to Jewish faith and Jewish nationality did not altogether escape the contagion. Indeed, the desire to approximate externally as much as possible to the usages of the Greek world, without renouncing, internally, the essentials of Judaism, produced a Judeo-Grecian literature, which, in point of time, extended over nearly three centuries, and continued till the destruction of Jerusalem."

To stem this tide of revolt from God; to bridle the passion for libertinism; to neutralize the ferment of innovation, so destructive to a form of religion which suffered no change; to reinstill a new love for the religion that is neither licentious nor profligate—in short, to restore allegiance to and confidence in the revealed religion of the Eternal One, the events of that time served an admirable purpose. A well-deserved punishment was inflicted, which would have extinguished the last spark of hope, had not the star of prophecy shone brightly in that dark hour. Then the predictions presented a sublime philosophy of history. They teach that every experience of mankind, the rise and fall of nations as well as the misfortunes which befell the Jewish race, were not mere accidents, but all in accord with Jehovah's eternal and unchanging purpose. The proclamation that God is working in and through all history, that the right will ultimately triumph and faithful service be rewarded, became foundation-stones in the faith of later Judaism

and Christianity. This fact will stand out in still bolder relief as we proceed.

7. Another specification is: "And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them." Fortunately, we do not have to conjecture what the meaning of this highly figurative language is. In Gabriel's explanation we are told, "And he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people."

Now, fancy that these words apply to Rome. During seven centuries of growth and extensive conquests that power waxed great, even to the Jewish nation! And Rome cast some of that people and its illustrious ones to the ground, and stamped upon them! Does not such an exegesis strike you as stating things more mildly than is warranted by the history of events? When Rome did chastise the Israelites, they were "led away captive into all nations." Luke 21: 24. Not *some* of them, but *all*, and every "star" included. That the words do, on the other hand, apply literally to Antiochus Epiphanes, that once disgraced, degraded Roman vassal, who rose to the eminence of overpowering Israel, thinking minds are forced to admit.

8. According to another specification, Antiochus should "also stand up against the Prince of princes." In verse 11 the wording is: "Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host." Jehovah is Is-

rael's prince; he is also the Prince of princes. And this being a direct statement of prophecy, it may not be twisted into an indirect application. The question to be settled is, whether Rome, at any time, did "stand up against," did magnify itself, even to the One who rules over the rulers of men. Do not bring in the story of the dragon now, for it wrought indirectly through Rome, and Rome became, in turn, indirectly culpable through the Jews. The proof demanded is, whether Rome ever did stand up directly against Jehovah in demanding the homage and obedience which belong to him alone. You will search history in vain to find an affirmative answer to the question. But in applying this to Antiochus, we find that it was his fixed purpose and dominant idea to introduce into his whole realm the worship of Zeus Olympius, with whom he identified himself, and through whose worship he expected to receive divine adoration. 1 Mac. 1:52. All other forms of worship were proscribed, and exterminated with a zeal equal to fanaticism. Accordingly, the worship of Jehovah was supplanted by an idolatrous one, in which Antiochus entered as a shareholder.

He found little difficulty to introduce this idolatry in Jerusalem, on account of the aid which he received from the Hellenizing party. The sinners having "filled up their measure," as was explained under heading 5, fell readily in line with his behest. 1 Mac. 1:12. The extermination of the holy people, together with the extinction of the revealed religion and a theocracy

on earth, looked like something inevitable. Up to the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews suffered nothing that can be compared with the cruelties inflicted by that insane king. All the previous powers to which Israel had been subject recognized its inalienable right to worship Jehovah. For instance, Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 4:31—), Darius the Mede (Dan. 6:27—), Cyrus (Ezra 1:2—), Artaxerxes Longimanus (Ezra 7:12—; Neh. 2:7—). Likewise did Alexander the Great. Josephus (*Ant.* XI, 8, 5), narrating the incidents of the meeting of Alexander and Israel's high priest, tells it as follows: "Jaddua met him at Gapha (Mizpeh) at a procession of priests and citizens in white. Alexander, at the sight of the linen-arrayed priests, and the high priest in blue and gold with the mitre and gold plate bearing Jehovah's name on his head, adored and embraced him; and having been shown Daniel's prophecy concerning him, he sacrificed to God in the court of the temple, and granted the Jews liberty to live according to their own laws, and freedom from tribute in sabbatical years." The aim and purpose of the prophecy of Daniel 8 was, therefore, to fortify the people of God against the wiles and attacks of their great foe, on the one hand, as well as to inspire hope when the enemy seemed to succeed in crushing everything.

9. "And by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down." Can this be applied to Rome? Let us listen to another prophecy, which unmistakably applies to Roman

times. We allude to this: "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease." Dan. 9:27. In the one the sacrifice was simply taken away, but restored after a certain number of days, as the record plainly states. In the other, under Roman rule, the sacrifices and oblations ceased. Ceased when? "In the midst of the week." That locates it definitely at the death of Christ, who was to cause them to cease. After that they had no more significance or value than any heathen sacrifice. And in harmony with this idea is the omission of any allusion to the temple service in connection with the Roman abomination of desolation. The record does not credit Rome with doing what was already done full thirty years before. It says simply: "And the people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary."

How perfectly the prophecy respecting the taking away of the daily sacrifice and the setting up of the abomination of desolation applies to Antiochus Epiphanes, can best be told in the following extract: "Having gained control of the center of Judaism [Jerusalem] the temple was dismantled and desecrated (Dan. 11:31). With the blood of Jewish victims was mingled that of unclean animals sacrificed in despite of the Jewish law. On the site of the great altar of Jehovah was set up, in December, 168 B. C., 'the abomination of desolation,' — an altar to Olympian Zeus. Ten days later, sacrifices were instituted upon it in

which all the remaining inhabitants in Jerusalem were obliged to participate. Within the sacred precincts were soon practiced all the immoral customs so often associated in that degenerate age with a heathen shrine (1 Mac. 1:37, 54, 59; 2 Mac. 6:2-5). All sacrifice to Jehovah of course ceased. By royal decree, the observation of the Sabbath or of the sacred feasts and practising the rite of circumcision were absolutely forbidden under penalty of death. All copies of the law were destroyed. Heathen altars and temples were erected throughout Judea, and every Jew was compelled in public to sacrifice to idols swine's flesh or that of some other unclean beast, and to present conclusive evidence that he had ceased to observe the laws of his fathers (1 Mac. 1:47-49). On the occasion of the feast of Dyonesius, every one was obliged to participate, marching in procession crowned with wreaths of ivy."

10. "And the place of his [the Prince of the host's] sanctuary was cast down." In describing the devastation caused by Appollonius, who had been sent against Jerusalem to give vent to Antiochus' exasperation because the Romans had forcibly dispossessed him of Egypt's crown, Rollin has given the following testimony: "The city was afterward plundered, and set fire to in several parts, after all the rich movables had been carried off. They demolished such parts of the houses as were still standing; and, with the ruins, built a strong fort on the top of one of the hills of the city of David, opposite to the temple, which it com-

manded." And Taylor testifies: "When they [the Maccabees] came to Mount Zion, and beheld the devastation of the city and temple, they rent their clothes, and gave vent to their sorrow in loud lamentations."—*Ancient History*.

11. "And the host was given over to it [the little horn] together with the continual burnt-offering through transgression." R. V. This agrees substantially with the marginal reading of the A. V. The historical events already quoted demonstrate the justification for inflicting punishment upon apostate Israel, who were bent upon following the Greek religion and morals. But what sense is there in seeking the fulfilment of this specification in either pagan or papal Rome? Under the "pagan form" the sacrifice was not taken away on account of transgression, but because type met antitype. The sacrifices simply ceased. They would have ceased then, even if Israel had led a life ever so holy. And much more absurd is the application to the "papal form." Taken in this broader sense, the "host," or "holy people," can be applied to no others than to Christians. The prophecy is then forced to mean that the followers of Jesus Christ were given over to suffer for their *transgressions*. Let all who still believe the old view cease their talk about persecution and martyrdom and call it henceforth a righteous retribution!"

12. "And it cast down the truth to the ground." Not satisfied with interrupting the sacrificial service, he was bent upon exterminating the very knowledge

of the true God. To this end, every copy of the law that could be found was fanatically destroyed. The observance of all sacred rites and institutions was strictly forbidden under penalty of death. It was a time of struggle for supremacy; the question at issue was whether Judaism was to be merged into the semi-civilized philosophy of Greece, which the masses of Israel had studied with so much assiduity, and which had acted so powerfully upon both the faith and the morals of the people. It was a time when faith in Jehovah's might over the world-power had to be restored.

13. "And it practised and prospered." In the providence of God, he served as a corrector of apostate Israel. His insane career and extreme cruelties went unchecked, until he had served God's purpose. He prospered, until the time for cleansing the sanctuary arrived.

14. He is also described as being "a king of fierce countenance." In one of Moses' prophecies (Deut. 28: 50), God threatened to bring against Israel a nation of fierce countenance as punishment for disobedience. The qualifying words used there being identical with those of the subject under consideration, many strenuously assume that the two passages allude to the same thing. But the conclusion is a *non sequitur*. The proof is no stronger than the claim would be that two persons are but one individual because both are called fair of face. In Deuteronomy the expression applies to a *nation*; in Daniel it serves to de-

scribe one of the characteristics of a *king*. The time when that king should stand up is specifically given; namely, "In the latter part of their kingdom." Any one who has read ancient history need but be reminded of the fact that the rule of Rome did not begin in the latter time of the four Grecian kingdoms. Besides, the Roman nation was not "broken without hands" as was the "king of fierce countenance." These diversities plainly prove non-identity.

According to the rendering of Isaac Leeser (Jewish), he was "a king impudent of face, and understanding deep schemes." "A king insolent and skilled in double-dealing," as translated by Bevan. He was devoid of customary respect and courtesy. And as regards double-dealing — artifice — craft — he was a master in the art. He expressed himself in words that disguised his secret designs; his aim being only to perplex affairs for the attainment of his own ends. Read Rollin's account.

Some urge that by the expression, "understanding dark sentences," the Latin is meant, which was the language of the Romans, and it is assumed that the Jews did not understand Latin. Granting this point does not facilitate the application to the Jews, for it is the king who understands the dark sentences. On the ground of this specification no thinking person will contend that the king represents the Roman nation, for then the prophecy is forced to mean that the Latins understood Latin. Such an application is not critically deep or correct; yet it has been published in

all seriousness, because the identity of Deut. 28: 50 and Dan. 8:23 was assumed. But facts would warrant such an application to Antiochus, since he had served thirteen years as a hostage in Rome, the seat of culture and society, where Latin was spoken, and whence he came direct to institute his schemes for obtaining possession of the Syrian throne.

15. "And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power." Released from vassalage through the intervention of his brother Seleucus, who gave his only son Demetrius in exchange for him, he started to return from Rome to Syria. When he had proceeded as far as Athens, he was informed of the assassination of his brother. It was also reported to him that the usurper stood at the head of a very strong party, and that another one was forming in favor of Ptolemy. In this exigency he turned to Eumenes, king of Pergamus, and to Attalus his brother, who seated him on the throne. No proclamation, by public act, was issued, conferring on him the kingdom. He obtained it by artifice, flattering Eumenes and Attalus of Pergamus, and canvassing the Syrian people high and low, as he had seen candidates do at Rome. Livy 41, 20. He answered very correctly to the following prophetic description: "And in his [brother's] estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries."

16. And lastly, "he shall be broken without hand."

His horrible death, ascribed by the Maccabees to a special visitation of Divine punishment, will be subsequently related. Thus, every specification applies to Antiochus, without warping or friction. The unwarrantable assertion that "he does not fulfil the specifications in one single particular," is, therefore, remanded with the recommendation that it be reconsidered and corrected.

Under the ninth heading an account is given of how the sanctuary was polluted, and its service interrupted. The task now remains to prove how exactly these, too, met their fulfilment. The question asked, in verse 13 of the Masoretic text, has greatly puzzled the translators. The early copyists have evidently corrupted the reading. Besides the rendering in our version, the following is suggested by Von Lengerke: "For how long is the vision—the continual offering and the desolating iniquity—the treading down both of the sanctuary and host?" Hitzig translates it: "For how long is the vision of the daily sacrifice—to leave unchecked the horrible iniquity and to trample down sanctuary and host?" Bevan gives what he conjectures the Hebrew basis of the Septuagint may have been, and then risks the following guess: "For how long is the vision to be, while the daily sacrifice is taken away, and the iniquity set up—from the time when he shall tread down the sanctuary and the service?" Whichever may be correct, or nearly so, Daniel had already learned that the daily sacrifice was to be interrupted; his curiosity was now naturally awa-

kened to know how long that period of desolation and the reign of abomination would last.

The answer, according to the rendering of the A. V., is: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The marginal reading gives "evenings and mornings" instead of "days." Bevan remarks that the phrase *ereb boker* "must be explained according to verse 26." This explanation must be correct, seeing it expresses the meaning given to it by Gabriel. Consequently, it is not a period of so many twenty-four hours, but equivalent to successive evenings and mornings. In Genesis 1, the evening and the morning—the two periods added—constitute one day. A similar coupling of words is found in Gen. 8:22, where it is stated that "seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease." In Behrmann's *Hand Kommentar zum Alten Testament* a similar instance of coupling of words is cited. He quotes the following from the poetry of Hildebrand: "*Sumaro enti wintro sehstic*," i. e., summers and winters sixty=thirty years. This view is endorsed by Ewald, Hitzig, Kuenen, Cornill, Bleek, Kayser, Delitsch, and others.

Gabriel said, "And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true." In this explanation, in which the symbols and the metaphors of the prophecy are dropped, the expression has not been changed to "day." There seems to be an express design in using the word *day*, namely, to prevent its

not

being used in a symbolic sense. If a day were really in the mind of the speaker, the word *yom* (day) would naturally have suggested itself first of all. Since it is a question respecting the continued suspension of the daily sacrifice, the words refer to the evening and the morning oblations. For this reason, the period, expressed in days, amounts to one-half as many days as there are evenings and mornings.

The next question affects the correctness of the number 2,300. In "The Sanctuary and the Twenty-three Hundred Days," by U. Smith, the following quotation is cited: "There is no number in the Bible whose genuineness is better ascertained than that of the 2,300 days. It is found in all the printed Hebrew editions, in all the MSS. of Kennicott and De Rossi's collations, and in all the ancient versions, except the Vatican copy of the Septuagint, which reads 2,400, followed by Symachus, and some copies noticed by Jerome, 2,200; both evidently literal errors, in excess and defect, which compensate each other and confirm the mean, 2,300."—*Dr. Hales*.

We confess an inability to see how the correctness is proved by the learned Doctor. Majorities can never really settle a disputed point. And if the Masoretic text plus many other Hebrew MSS. settle a point conclusively, then it must be conceded that our version of Ex. 12:40 is the correct one, notwithstanding the Septuagint renders it thus: "The sojourning of the children and of their fathers in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt was four hundred and thirty

years." Upon the strength of this reading, and other historical facts, commentators do not hesitate to ignore the testimony of the majority to the contrary. Majorities fail to prove anything, unless they prove the truth.

According to the evidence submitted, the ancient MSS. differ. A board of review, appointed in this day and age of the world, can not go back of their returns, to settle the correctness of either the 2,400, the 2,300, or the 2,200. There is, however, a way of settling the question conclusively. Let history—the fulfilled prophecy—settle for us which one of the three is entitled to be regarded as the true reading. No one can object to the fairness of this test. Its correctness is absolute.

The cleansing of the sanctuary clearly denotes the end of the period. From the wording of Dan. 8:13 we can not determine so very accurately with what it begins, because translators find the wording hazy, as has been shown. Therefore we turn to another scripture which applies to the same events. In Dan. 11:31 it is plainly stated: "And they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." From these pollutions the sanctuary was cleansed; the time of their occurrence therefore constitutes the beginning of the period. Newton and his followers branch off at verse 30, and apply what follows to Rome. But their conclusion is not in harmony with the specification, for the

narrative flows without interruption in the line of Grecian history; besides, the taking away of the daily sacrifice is not chargeable to Roman conduct, inasmuch as Christ, under Rome's dominion, caused them to cease.

How long a space of time, then, lies between the two points? How many evening and morning oblations were omitted? History furnishes us the following information regarding the initial date: "On the fifteenth day of the month Casleu, in the one hundred forty and fifth year [of the Selucid era, or the year 168 B. C.], they set up the *abomination of desolation* on the altar." 1 Mac. 1:54. In other words, an idol altar and image of Jupiter Olympius was erected upon the altar of burnt-offerings. This stopped the offering of Jewish sacrifices. And ten days later, namely on the twenty-fifth day of the same month, the sacrifices to Jupiter began. On that date, too, the sanctuary was polluted by being sprinkled with a broth of swine's flesh.

In 1 Mac. 4:52-54 the exact year, month, and day are given, when the temple service was resumed. It is described in the following language: "Now on the five and twentieth day of the ninth month, which is called the month Casleu, in the hundred forty and eighth year [165 B. C.] they rose up betimes in the morning, and offered sacrifice according to the law upon the new altar of burnt-offerings, which they had made. Look, at what time and what day the heathen had profaned it, even in that was it dedicated

with songs, and citherns, and harps, and cymbals.” Josephus’ remarks on this period are couched in these words: “This desolation happened to the temple in the hundred forty and fifth year, on the twenty-fifth day of the month Apelleus, and on the hundred fifty and third olympiad; but it was dedicated anew, on the same day, the twenty-fifth of the month Apelleus, on the hundred and forty-eighth year, and on the hundred and fifty-fourth olympiad. And this desolation came to pass according to the prophecy of Daniel, which was given four hundred and eight years before; for he declared that the Macedonians [a name also denoting the Greeks] would dissolve the worship [for some time].” Ant. XII, 7, 6. In another place he says: “And that from among them [the four horns] there should arise a certain king that should overcome our nation and their laws, and should take away their political government, and should spoil the temple, and forbid the sacrifices to be offered for three years’ time. And indeed it so came to pass, that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes, according to Daniel’s vision, and what he wrote many years before they came to pass.”—*Antiquities* X, 11, 7. Josephus failed to make mention of the ten days. The full period lasted three years and ten days.

The Jews did not reckon time in an arbitrary way. The Lord had ordained each new moon to be the beginning of a new month, which was announced, at the temple, by the blowing of trumpets, and solemnized by offering special sacrifices. Their beginning

was not established by astronomical calculations, but by the testimony of watchers, appointed to watch for the first appearance of the new moon; and then the fact was signaled abroad through the land by kindling fires upon elevated locations. Their months were, therefore, lunar months of $29\frac{1}{2}$ days' duration; or, one month contained but 29 days and the next one 30. In twelve such months there were but 354 days. These fell short of being a solar year. The shortage was partially remedied at the end of every third year by intercalating a thirteenth month. Hence there were in a period of three years $3 \times 354 = 1,062$, plus $29 = 1,091$ days.

But the period being ten days longer than 1,091 days, the full duration was $1,091 + 10 = 1,101$ days. This includes the twenty-fifth day of the month Cas-leu, on which the daily sacrifices were resumed. The exact length from the beginning up to the end of the period is, therefore, exactly 1,100 days, or 2,200 evenings and mornings. This proves the correct reading of the text to be: "Unto two thousand and two hundred evenings and mornings, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

Keunen, too,—"*Historisch-Critisch Onderzoek*,"—follows the trail with precision. His reasons for the terminal points are well grounded. Briefly stated, he says: "In verse 13 the period is plainly named, during which the daily sacrifices were to cease, the horrible iniquity set up, and sanctuary and host to remain trodden under foot; and just as plainly is the 'justi-

fiction' of the sanctuary named in verse 14 as the *terminus ad quem* [terminus to which]. For this reason, too, we prefer the theory of Bleek. Between the desecration and the cleansing of the temple there lay (1 Mac. 1:54; 4:52) exactly three years; or, if the first be reckoned from the fifteenth of Casleu, three years and ten days, *i. e.*, $3 \times 354 + 30$ [29] for a *mensis intercalaris* = $1,092 + 10 = 1,102$ days. Consequently forty-eight less than are required." This is on the assumption that 2,300 is the correct reading. Had he computed the time a little more accurately and taken 2,200 as the correct reading, he, too, would have solved the problem with the utmost precision.

To bring the foregoing calculations wholly within the pale of certainty, the following additional proof of an impartial and unbiased critic is submitted. Dissertation IV of the Appendix to Whiston's "Josephus" is devoted to a consideration of what copy of the Old Testament served as the authentic record upon which Josephus relied in writing his "Antiquities." "That Josephus' copy," says Whiston, "was not a little different from the Samaritan and Septuagint copies, as they stood in his age, and much more from the Masorete copy, as it has been since the days of Barchocab, is most evident. That his copy was, generally speaking, more perfect and authentic than those other copies, will certainly appear by a critical comparison of them all along; and has been frequently observed and proved in my Essay toward restoring the true text of the Old Testament, and in my Sup-

plement to the Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies." What copy Josephus had we can best tell by quoting his very words anent this point. "Titus Cæsar," thus reads his own account, "when the city of Jerusalem was taken by force, persuaded me frequently to take whatever I pleased out of the ruins of my country; for he told me that he gave me leave so to do. But there being nothing that I much valued, now my country was destroyed, I only asked of Titus liberty for myself and my family, as the only comfort now remaining in my calamities; *I also had the holy books by his concession.*" From this testimony it is plain that Josephus had the authentic copy of the Old Testament found in the temple. And the following instances prove that he quoted from the Scriptures "laid up in the temple"; namely, his narrative relating the miracle of the water flowing out of the rock, and of the sun's standing still. *Antiq.*, Bk. III, ch. 1, sec 7; Bk. V, ch. 1, sec. 17.

After a long dissertation upon the authenticity of that copy, in which many examples of proofs are cited, Whiston finally, in the closing paragraph, comes to the admission which is so very pertinent to the point under consideration. He gives the reason why Josephus, in his "Antiquities," corrected inaccuracies found in his "Wars of the Jews," and "honestly owns, with the original authors of the two books of the *Macca-bees*, that such profanation [of the temple] continued but three years only; which last is also, I think, a remarkable application of Daniel's prophecies, I mean

that of the one thousand one hundred evenings and one thousand one hundred mornings, two thousand two hundred in all, Dan. 8:14, which seems to have been the number in Josephus' copy, as Jerome says some would have it in his time; instead of those two thousand three hundred in our Masorete Hebrew, in Clem. Alex. in Africanus, in the MS. Alex., and those two thousand four hundred in our Vatican copy." Thus our explanation stands approved not only by history, but also supported by authority before which later copies must bow.

But very little has been said about the treading under foot of the host. For a detailed account of their sufferings, the reader is referred to the history of the Maccabees. In Heb. 11:34-38 an undoubted allusion to their martyrdom is also found. The forsakers of the holy covenant, who had imbibed the Greek notion that all religions are equally good for keeping the masses in check, eventually experienced the falsity of the theory, to their sorrow.

The prominence given to Antiochus Epiphanes in Daniel is because it was the turning-point in Jewish history, deciding whether Greek worldly refinement was to stifle Israel's true faith. "Persecution was God's appointed way to save his people from seductions which had well-nigh made them compromise their witness for the truth."—*Fausset*. And Milman testifies on this wise: "As a last insult the feasts of the Bacchanalia, the license of which, as they were celebrated in the later days of Greece, shocked the

severe virtue of the older Romans, were substituted for the national festival of Tabernacles. The reluctant [pious] Jews were forced to join in these riotous orgies and carry the ivy, the insignia of the god. So near was the Jewish nation and the worship of Jehovah to total extermination.”—*History of the Jews*.

Antiochus was the unconscious instrument in God's hand to scourge them back onto the path of faith and rectitude. The savage and insane violence of this tyrant was, in fact,—and surely we may say proverbially,—the safeguard of the Jews against the greatest moral danger to which they had ever been exposed: the slow and insidious, but certain and destructive, advance of indifference to religious truth, evinced by encroachments and gradual prevalence of Grecian manners, Grecian corruption, Grecian idolatry, and Grecian atheism.

His fanatacism aroused the dormant energies of the whole Jewish people, so that the zealous attachment to the law and the truth of the Lord, united with the generous desire for national independence, gave a tone of exaltation to the character of the people, and evoked enthusiasm, a courage, both active and passive, which set at defiance the utmost power of Antiochus, and which then, and ever since, in the stern hour of trial, has animated and sustained the Jews to such an extent that it has, in fact, rendered them imperishable.

“Had they basely yielded to Antiochus,”—we quote again from “Post-Biblical History of the Jews”—“they

might have escaped the ill inflicted upon them; they might, like the other inhabitants of geographical Syria, have merged into a nationality so contemptible, that, in the Greek and Roman plays, the word "slave" and "Syrian" were synonymous; and that, even before the war which crushed Syria, the Roman Consul T. Q. Flaminius, in reply to a pompous harangue of the ambassadors of Antiochus the Great before the Greek National Assembly at Ægium (192 B. C.) could take upon himself to declare that 'the vile name of Syrian comprehended every form of baseness, vice, and servility.' Plutarch, in Flamin, and Tit. Liv. lxxxv. cap. 49.

"With this corrupt, effeminate, and base, but elegant, highly polished and pleasure-loving nationality the Jews might have been amalgamated. But what would have been the consequence to them? Like those base Syrians, they would have been swept from the face of the earth; their identity would have been at an end; their national existence obliterated; their influence in the destinies of mankind gone forever. The sacred mission, however, that had been entrusted to them did not permit so miserable a consummation to their wondrous history; the high and holy truth of which they were the guardians and witnesses forbade so ridiculous a downfall of their lofty aspiration.

"As the Jews were the only people to whom, nationally, a positive religion had been revealed, the dogmas of which excluded all worship but that of

God alone, while all around them pantheism and idolatry, with their ever-shifting mythology, prevailed, the Jews, among all various religious systems, were the first to make a stand in defense of their faith. Theirs was the glory of being first called upon to uphold the truth of their belief at the price of life, and to seal their conviction with their heart's best blood. But as they were the first martyrs persecuted for conscience' sake, so they were likewise the first champions in the cause of religious liberty. The Greek who conquered at Marathon fought for national independence; the Romans who expelled Tarquin gained a triumph for civil liberty; but the handful of Jews who, under Judas Maccabeus and his brothers, drew the sword against the overwhelming power of Antiochus and his successors, made their stand for religious freedom and the rights of conscience."

We owe yet a more specific account of how he was literally "broken without hands," as well as when the host ceased to be trodden under foot. And this being a matter purely historical, we shall quote, on this point, from M. J. Raphael's "History of the Jews." The following will elucidate the last-named specification: "With the reopening of the temple at Jerusalem, and the public observance of the Jewish religion throughout the land, the actual rule of the Syro-Grecian kings over Judea may be said to have terminated. For though the war between the province of Judea and the empire of Syria continued many years longer; though the successors of Antiochus al-

ways claimed and often exercised power and sovereignty over Palestine, and the Jews themselves did not proclaim their independence till nearly a quarter of a century later, yet, from the moment Judas Maccabeus took possession of Jerusalem, he and after him his brothers became *de facto* rulers of the land. He and they were at the head of the armed force; he and they conducted the internal administration and the foreign policy of Judea; he and they treated with the kings of Syria as an independent power against another independent power, and entered into treaties of alliance with foreign governments, without the sanction, and contrary to the will, of these kings, whose authority in Judea extended no farther than the spot momentarily held by their army, and ceased altogether as soon as that army was forced to retreat."

And regarding the death of the oppressor, he gives the following description: "In an attempt on the temple of Jupiter, at Elymais, he first learned of the repeated discomfitures and routs of his army in Judea—tidings which exasperated to fury the wounds which his pride had received at Elymais. Transported with ungovernable passion, he swore, in the excess of his rage, that utter destruction should be the lot of the Jews, and that Palestine should become their grave. While he urged the march of his troops westward with the utmost precipitation, the immoderate quantities of wine, which he unceasingly swallowed, caused him to be attacked with a painful and

incurable disease of the intestines. Yet on he went, his mouth, amid deep curses, uttering the fell purpose of his heart, till, in his reckless haste, his chariot was upset. He was thrown out and much hurt; and the foul and diseased state of his body, acting upon his wounds, caused them to breed vermin, and to emit so pestiferous a smell that his attendants dared not approach him. In this loathsome and horrible condition, he died at the obscure village of Tabœ, situated near the extremity of Mt. Zagros, on the road to Babylon" (164 B. C.). For other particulars see 2 Mac. 9.

The explanation has, necessarily, been made as brief as possible. The historical evidence adduced is but fragmentary. Yet the way is blazed; with the requisite historical material at hand, it is an easy matter to swell the details to any desired degree of fullness. And as regards the historical evidence, there is a great plenty of it. For several of the quotations presented we are indebted to authorities found in the Chicago Public Library, which contains many volumes on Jewish history. Whoever desires to delve deeper into the study of this subject can find there a vast amount of material that is readily accessible.

At the close of his history of Antiochus Epiphanes, Rollin presents the following testimony relative to the subject under consideration: "No prophecy," he says, "was ever fulfilled in so clear, so perfect, and so indisputable a manner as this. Porphyry, the professed

enemy of the Christian religion, as well as of the Old and the New Testament, being infinitely perplexed in finding so great a conformity between the events foretold by Daniel, and the relations given by the best historians, did not pretend to deny this conformity; for that would have been repugnant to sense, and denying the shining of the sun at noonday. However, he took another course in order to undermine the authority of the Scriptures. He himself labored, by citing all the historians extant at that time, and which are since lost, to show, in a very extensive manner, that whatever is written in the eleventh chapter of Daniel, happened exactly as foretold by the prophet; and he concluded from this perfect uniformity that so exact a detail of so great a number of events could not possibly have been written by Daniel so many years before they happened; and that this work must certainly have been written by some person who lived after Antiochus Epiphanes, and borrowed Daniel's name."

Think of a fulfillment so complete and convincing that an able enemy of Christianity did not pretend to deny the conformity to the prophecy, but even lent assistance in proving the correctness of the application. And then think of the would-be interpreters of the same prophecy, who, in modern times, have invented crude interpretations that are "repugnant to the sense" of historically enlightened minds. They either ignorantly or else deliberately repudiate the long array of evidence which forced Porphyry to shield behind the transparent subterfuge, that the

prophecy was but mere history. How easily they might have helped him out of his dilemma by merely dropping the suggestion that the little horn represents "pagan Rome" and "papal Rome"! We fancy that he would have dismissed them with the counsel to school themselves more thoroughly in history, before they again attempted to stand up as expounders of the plainly fulfilled word.

Misapplied prophecy unavoidably brings disappointment in the end. Perforce this inexorable law, thousands were disappointed in 1844. The few who then survived the shipwreck of faith, revised their creed to suit the exigency of the case. Nevertheless, the expedient proved to be but an abortive attempt in constructing a theory that will harmonize with the terms of the prophecy. Even in its latest, up-to-date, remodeled form it can not yet stand the test of sound, scriptural criticism. The fact of the matter is, it is an utter impossibility to harmonize the doctrine of the heavenly sanctuary with a prophecy dealing with the pollution and the cleansing of the Jewish temple. It lacks the "eternal fitness" of things.

In a modified form Miller's theory is still believed. During full seventy years it has been believed that the sanctuary was to be cleansed at the end of the 2,300 years. The time is not far distant when the numerical reading of the Septuagint will be accepted as the correct one. This is neither a bold assertion nor a prophetic guess, for the shrewder ones already admit that we are, at this very day and hour, much

nearer the 2,400 than the 2,300 mark. The idea has received favorable consideration. And why should it not, seeing they allow ample time for it since the present slogan is, "The gospel to all the world in this generation."

All correctly interpreted prophecy affixes the seal of confirmation to the vision, and begets a stronger confidence in every other word of God. When "thus it is written," and "thus it behooved" can be laid side by side, the demonstration is incontrovertible. It is proof that begets conviction. But such futile attempts as have been assailed, beget distrust and unbelief. Quite a while may intervene between the sowing and the reaping, nevertheless the harvest will follow after the seedtime. Accordingly, it is an open secret that very many "veterans of the cause" have lost their former conviction. Hundreds of others have slipped their anchors, and are now, like derelicts upon the ocean, drifting toward destruction. They are threatened with disbelief in God and his revealed religion.

Aside from correcting mistaken ideas, it is our aim, in writing this, to inspire confidence in the utmost reliability of the prophetic word. Prophecy is a sure word, and we are admonished to give heed to it, as unto a light shining in a dark place. It is given for guidance through the dark mazes of life's labyrinth. But that light misinterpreted becomes a menace to safety. The beacons lit along the coast serve to guide the mariner into the desired haven. Yet, when the color or the flashes of those lights are mis-

taken for those placed at other locations, the rocks and shoals are not looked for in their proper places; and thus the very lights may cause destruction. On the other hand, when prophecy is correctly interpreted, its guidance is absolutely safe. But when its meaning is misconstrued, people wrest it, like any other portion of Scripture, to their own detriment or destruction.

At first glance, the foregoing explanation of Daniel 8 may seem to undermine the belief in the nearness of the Lord's coming. If any one's belief is built upon that prophecy, then the interpretation tends to undermine his belief. This is freely and frankly admitted. We do not desire to be misunderstood. We have striven to prove that that prophecy *does not contain the remotest allusion to our Saviour or to his mediatorial work*. Thousands of firm believers in the doctrine of the advent have never even so much as dreamed of proving their faith by that prophecy. It would never have been used to prove the proximity of that event, if Wm. Miller and his colaborers had but taken the pains to test his interpretation by historical evidence. As it turned out—and it logically could not turn out otherwise—his application was wrong as to event, nature, and time. His theory should have been rejected then and there, because it failed to stand the test. It stood condemned, even before it went to trial, for "of that day and that hour knoweth no man." Nevertheless, thousands believed

him, rather than God's caution. Their disappointment is, therefore, not chargeable to the Lord.

To err is human, to acknowledge an error requires more than the average amount of courage; and to point out an error is a thankless task. Some misconstrue the motive, with others the paramount question is, Who said it? or Who believes it? A very few weigh the evidence with the least, or with no, prejudice.

The world of to-day lives in expectancy, as did they who saw Messiah's "star in the east," at the time of his first advent. Christians, whose thoughts are not wholly engrossed with the cares of this life, or bent on seeking the pleasures of the world, perceive the shadows of coming events. Devout men and women are interpreting the signs of the times, which presage the ushering in of another day. The mission fields are white, and waiting for the sickle to be thrust in. The proclamation of the gospel is already heard in all lands. Hundreds of missionaries feel constrained to work like men who rescue others from a sinking ship. These, as well as other signs, betoken that the Spirit leads where the definite (numerically expressed) guidance of prophecy fails. Let us all see to it, then, that we are amenable to his guidance; let us listen to his whispers; for then shall we read the signs aright, and not be found without oil in our lamps when the Bridegroom comes.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE 1844 TIME THEORY

BY MOSES E. KELLOGG.

THE prophetic symbols of the book of Daniel have long been the cause of much study and exposition, often combined with considerable speculation. The study of these, as of all scripture, is profitable, and perhaps such study and attempted exegesis is impossible without some degree of speculation; but when the speculation is of such a nature that its acceptance leads to a great religious excitement and almost world-wide movement, culminating in the disappointment and consequent loss of faith in the hearts of thousands of sincere people, it would be better, to say the least, had such speculation not been indulged. As most of our readers are probably aware, the prophetic period contained in Daniel 8, commonly treated of and referred to as the 2,300 days, was the basis of the wide-spread belief of many people that Christ would make his second advent to this world in the year 1844. It is also as well, perhaps better, known that nothing of the kind occurred; and although sixty-three years of time have elapsed since 1844, the looked-for event has not yet transpired.

The disappointment of those who expected the return of Christ in 1844 was keenly felt by all who had preached and believed the doctrine, and having made considerable stir in the world, and drawn upon

themselves a large amount of adverse criticism, they were very reluctant to give up the idea that they were entirely wrong in their exposition of the prophetic symbols. To maintain their position in the face of the fact that nothing such as they had predicted had occurred, some made new discoveries in prophetic reckoning by which the time was somewhat prolonged; but the last date set by these zealous but evidently misguided persons has long passed by, and no reputable people who take the name of "Adventist" now have any fixed time for the coming of Christ and the end of all things,—time having fully demonstrated the futility of such calculations.

It may be here remarked that the scripture most used to prove that Christ would come in 1844 does not state that Christ would come at any time, but that "Unto two thousand and three hundred days then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Dan 8:14. The deduction from this text was that the word "sanctuary" meant the earth, and that the cleansing would be by fire.

The passing of the set time with nothing that could be seen to mark the alleged ending of the prophetic period developed another theory,—that the sanctuary referred to in the text is in heaven; and that the cleansing is the last work of Christ as the Mediator and High Priest of the Christian age, the work corresponding to that of the Jewish high priest under the Levitical law; and as the work of cleansing or justification of that Levitical sanctuary occupied

only the last day of the yearly round of services, and probably only a part of that day, it was argued that this period of cleansing would necessarily be very brief and that at its close Christ would come.

The writer will here make the frank statement that he for many years held the last-mentioned view, but he would add that he was not one of the original 1844 Adventists. He never passed through the period of disappointment, but inherited his faith in the 1844 sanctuary-cleansing theory from those who first received it, and accepted it at a time when from youth and the lack of a proper knowledge of history he was unable correctly to weigh evidence and to decide for himself in an intelligent manner matters of so grave importance.

Those who have held to the theory of the sanctuary in heaven to be cleansed, beginning at 1844, have often contended with those who maintain that the earth is the sanctuary, that the long period of time that has elapsed since 1844 is proof positive that they are wrong in their views; and now it strikes the writer with great force that they also may retort against those who hold the heavenly sanctuary theory that time has also demonstrated the fallacy of their position. Indeed, we believe it to be a fact that all those who have looked for the end of the prophetic period of Daniel 8 at any time in this or any subsequent time, are wandering in the dark, and that time, instead of relieving their minds by the realization of their hopes, will only plunge them deeper into

perplexity, further disappointment, gloom, and despair.

It is, therefore, the part of wisdom for those who have been holding this view, carefully to consider this prophecy again, studying it as though they had never studied it before. They should also be willing to give up any preconceived view, no matter how dear it may be to them or how truly believed and honestly advocated by men whom they have held and may still hold as men of the highest Christian character, recognizing the fact that through all time good men make mistakes in their calculations.

We now, therefore, invite those who read these lines to study with us anew this prophecy.

THE PROPHEPIC SYMBOLS.

The symbols of this chapter are (1) a ram with two horns; (2) a he-goat with a certain remarkable development of horns; (3) a prophetic period commonly referred to as the 2,300 days.

Of the first symbol it is necessary to say but little, as the angel in his explanation to Daniel declared that the ram represents the Medo-Persian kingdom. The goat is, also, declared to be a symbol of Grecia, and the great horn that was between his eyes, and that was afterward broken, is explained to signify the first king. As Alexander, commonly called the Great, was the first Grecian king that combined all the Grecian states in a war against a foreign power, and particularly as the subsequent division of his em-

pire into four Grecian kingdoms is in exact harmony with the symbols, students of prophecy, without respect to creed, have universally declared that the great horn symbolized Alexander, and that the four horns that came up in its place, when the great horn was broken, represented the four kingdoms of Macedon, Thrace, Syria, and Egypt, into which the empire of Alexander was divided.

So far Bible expositors are generally in harmony with each other; but concerning the next development there is a variety of opinions: "And out of one of them [the four horns of the goat] came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it practiced and prospered." Dan. 8:9-12.

Of this little horn that came out of the one of the horns of the goat, really a king or power that came out of one of the four kingdoms into which the empire of Alexander was divided at his death, there is difference of opinion, chief of which are (1) that it is a symbol of the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes, one of the Syrian line of Greek kings; (2) that it is a symbolic prophecy of the Roman power in its two forms of Pagan and Papal Rome.

Of those who have held these divergent views of

the prophecy, the earliest Bible expositors claimed that the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes was meant. Later, some Protestant commentators thought that they saw in the prophecy of this power an outline of the Roman empire.

ANTIOCHUS AND NOT ROME.

After having studied these views and the grounds for the same with great carefulness, the writer is of the opinion that the earliest Biblical expositors are right, and that the little horn of Daniel 8 is used in this prophecy to represent Antiochus Epiphanes and his sacriligious attacks upon the Jewish people and the profanation of their sanctuary, which he accomplished.

We would first remark that as the angel distinctly stated that the rough goat was a symbol of Grecia, it therefore follows that all that pertains to it is Grecian. The great horn in the forehead of the goat was a symbol of a Greek king, Alexander. The other four notable horns that came up when the great horn was broken were also Greek dynasties, as all must admit. It is therefore perfectly consonant with reason to conclude that the last-mentioned little horn that came out of one of the Greek horns is also Greek, and it would be inconsistent to hold that it was anything else.

It is also a fact that Rome did *not* come out of any of the Greek kingdoms. Rome, in its rise, was entirely outside of the Greek dominions. The Ro-

mans were a rising and strong people in the days of Alexander; and, at the time of his conquests, they declared that had he turned his arms in their direction, they would have taught him a lesson. The most able exponent of the view that the little horn is a symbol of Rome, can only say upon this point that as Rome had conquered Macedon, one of the Greek kingdoms, B. C. 168, and made its league with the Jews, B. C. 161, "it therefore *appeared* to the prophet, or may be properly spoken of in this prophecy, as coming forth from one of the horns of the goat."—*Thoughts on Daniel*, p. 154.

Of this statement it may be said that the prophet is not telling what appeared to him, but what really was, and Rome did not really come out of any one of the Greek kingdoms. It grew for centuries before it even came in contact with any of the Greek states.

Notice further the time of the rise of the little horn power: "And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences shall stand up." Dan. 8:23.

It is remarkable how those who hold the little horn to be a symbol of Rome, slip over this very important chronological statement, "In the latter time of their kingdom." Whose kingdom?—The four kingdoms that rose out of Alexander's broken empire. Then the Greek kingdoms of Alexander's successors had not passed away when the little horn arose, and hence Rome had not yet come into the field of proph-

ecy when the little horn performed its work. If Rome were the power referred to, it would be *following* the four kingdoms and not *in their time*. The fact that this little horn kingdom existed and acted "In the time of their kingdom," is absolute proof that it did not reign and act in the time allotted to Rome for the performance of its work, and that it is one of the Greek kings. Notice also the similarity of the language used in Daniel 8, to that used in the Apocrypha in describing Antiochus Epiphanes: "And after his [Alexander's] death they [Alexander's servants] put crowns upon themselves, so did their sons after them many years, and evils were multiplied. And there came out of one of them a wicked root, Antiochus Epiphanes." 1 Mac. 1:9, 10.

We are now ready to inquire at what time in the line of the Syrian Greek kings were the reign and wicked exploits of Antiochus Epiphanes.

The first of the Seleucidea, or Syrian line of kings, was Seleucus, who began to reign B. C. 306. This line of kings continued until B. C. 65, or 241 years. Antiochus Epiphanes reigned from B. C. 175 to 164. He therefore began to reign when 131 years of the Seleucid dynasty was in the past; and as he reigned to B. C. 164, and as the Seleucid empire came to an end B. C. 65, he reigned 131 years from the beginning of the line and to within 99 years of its end. He therefore reigned in the *latter part* of the Seleucid line of kings. And since all the Greek kingdoms came under the power of Rome at nearly the same

time, the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes was, as this prophecy declares, "in the latter time of their [the Greek powers'] kingdom."

Again, the whole work of the little horn carries the impression that it is one single king rather than that of a long line of kings, or a government that covered many centuries. Its work was accomplished "in the time of their kingdom" (the Greek successors of Alexander), whereas the career of Rome was continued for many centuries after the Greek empires had perished.

It is an axiomatic truth, accepted by all Bible students, that the connection of any power with the people of God is the cause of its introduction into prophecy. Now, if the little horn be a symbol of Rome, it could not begin its work as a desolating power before B. C. 161, when its famous league with the Jews was made. As a matter of fact, Rome was at first the protector of the Jews, and did not begin a warfare against them until about A. D. 70, when, because of their rebellion, Titus took Jerusalem. If Rome is intended by the little horn, and it has 2,300 years of warfare against the people of God to perform, then we must look for 2,300 years of time from A. D. 70. There is no evading this conclusion.

THE CAREER OF ANTIOCHUS.

Before we proceed any further, we will put together all that is said of this power whose identity we are seeking to ascertain.

“And out of one of them came forth a little horn which waxed exceeding great, toward the south and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land: and it waxed great even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground and stamped upon them. Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression; and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practiced and prospered.” Verses 9-12.

Add to this the angel's explanation: —

“And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.” Verses 23-25.

We have already proved that Antiochus Epiphanes reigned at the right time to fulfill this prophecy, ~~and that Rome did not~~. Now let us further study the career of this king.

Did Antiochus Epiphanes make any conquest in

the south?—He did. He conquered Egypt and made it a part of his empire. Proof: “Now when the kingdom was established before Antiochus Epiphanes, he thought to reign over Egypt, that he might have dominion over two realms. Therefore he entered Egypt with a great multitude, with chariots, and elephants, and horsemen, and a great army, and made war against Ptolome, king of Egypt; but Ptolome was afraid of him and fled, and many of them were wounded to death. Thus they got the strong cities in the land of Egypt, and he took the spoils thereof.” 1 Mac. 1:16-19.

What did he do in the east? He ravaged Persia and Armenia with fire and sword. Proof: “He [Antiochus Epiphanes] resolved to divide his forces into two parts, to give command of one of his armies to Lysias, descended from the royal blood, in order that he might subdue the Jews, and marched the other into Armenia and afterwards into Persia, to reinstate the affairs of those provinces in their former flourishing condition. . . . After passing Mount Taurus he entered Armenia, defeated Artaxias and took him prisoner. He marched from thence into Persia where he supposed he would have no further trouble of that rich province and those in its neighborhood.” Rollin, Book 18, p. 136.

What were his operations in the pleasant land?—He took Jerusalem and murdered a vast number of the Jews,—the mighty and the holy people. The terrible butcheries and other crimes of the most shock-

ing character that he committed on the people of Israel are recorded in the first book of the Maccabees and in Josephus' and Rollin's histories. Those who defend the view that the little horn is a symbol of Rome, are very careful never to mention these acts of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Again, in exact harmony with the prophecy, Antiochus Epiphanes took away or, in other words, stopped the daily sacrifices of the Jews and had heathen sacrifices offered in their place: "Now the fifteenth day of the month Casleu, in the one hundred forty and fifth year, they [Antiochus Epiphanes and his army] set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar, and builded idol altars throughout the cities of Judea on every side, and burnt incense at the doors of their houses and in the streets." 1 Mac. 1: 54, 55.

The book of Maccabees also tells how the sanctuary was trodden down and defiled:

"And behold our sanctuary, even our beauty and our glory is laid waste, and the Gentiles have defiled it." 1 Mac. 2: 12.

Again: "Now Jerusalem lay void as a wilderness, there was none of her children that went in or out: the sanctuary also was trodden down and aliens kept the stronghold: the heathen had their habitation in that place, and joy was taken from Jacob, and the pipe with the harp ceased. For thy sanctuary is trodden down and profaned, and thy priests are in heaviness and brought low." 1 Mac. 3: 45, 51.

“A king of fierce countenance.” These words could not apply to a long line of kings of various characters and dispositions. They do exactly describe Antiochus Epiphanes, who was a man in whom all noble thoughts were dead. He is held up by all historians as a perfect example of a ferocious tyrant. “He caused craft to prosper in his hand.” By the high honor he bestowed upon such of the Jews as would give up their religion, he made a peace that destroyed many souls. The expression “host of heaven” which is said to have been cast down by him, must be a figurative allusion to the dignitaries of the Jewish people. Those who were like the stars in the darkness, and who refused to give up the worship of Jehovah were destroyed without mercy. The high priest was deposed and a renegade Jew was placed in his room. These works were not accomplished by his own power, but God permitted him to punish his people because of their transgressions.

Thus in every particular the history of Antiochus Epiphanes fulfils the prophecy of the little horn of Daniel 8. And if the reader will take the pains to study the first book of the Maccabees, in the apocryphal scriptures, and Josephus’ and Rollin’s histories, he will find many other confirmatory proofs that we have not space to use in this brief treatise.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

At this time it is proper that a careful and candid consideration should be given to certain arguments

that are used to sustain the idea that Antiochus Epiphanes is *not* the one whose career is symbolized by the little horn of Daniel 8.

1. It is argued that Antiochus Epiphanes could not be the little horn and at the same time a part of the horn from which he sprang. Or, as an able and honest exponent of the view that Rome is the subject of this prophecy thus expresses it: "Antiochus Epiphanes, then, was simply one of the twenty-six kings who constituted the Syrian horn of the goat. He was for the time being that horn; hence could not be at the same time a separate and independent power or another and remarkable horn as the little horn was."—*Thoughts on Daniel*, pp. 151, 152.

The Syrian horn certainly includes Antiochus Epiphanes, but it could hardly be said that any one of its twenty-six kings at any time constituted that horn. It took them all together to make it. The four notable horns were symbolic of four *dynasties*. The reader will also recall the fact that the goat was a symbol of the whole Grecian empire from the first to the last, but at the same time one horn on the head of that goat was a symbol of one individual king, Alexander, as all admit. Now just as the goat was a symbol of Grecia as a whole, and at the same time the one notable horn in its forehead represented one king, so the Syrian horn represented the whole line of the Syrian kings, the dynasty,—but the little horn that came out of it represented one king of the line whose career the Lord wished especially to de-

scribe. Did the Lord wish to foretell with minuteness the history of one king of this Syrian line, how else better could he do it than by describing it as a little horn coming out of a larger one? As before remarked, the whole Greek empire, in all its phases and divisions, is symbolized by the goat and its various development of horns; and it would be highly incongruous to speak of Rome as being in any way evolved from the Greek empire.

2. "If it were proper to apply this symbol to any one of the Syrian kings, it should certainly be applied to the most powerful and illustrious of them all. . . . Although he took the name Epiphanes, that is, The Illustrious, . . . some thinking him a fool and others a madman, they changed the name of Epiphanes into Epimanes, or the 'Mad Man.'"—*Thoughts on Daniel*, p. 152.

Precisely, and for the very reason that he "magnified himself in his heart" and called himself the "illustrious," when he acted like a mad man, is the best reason why his career is noted in prophecy. The other kings of his line did not wage a cruel and relentless warfare against the people of God, did not take away the sacrifice, did not profane the sanctuary and tread it under foot, and so they are not introduced into the prophecy in any specific manner. As before stated, the connection of any power with the people of God is a special reason that attention is called to it in the prophetic scriptures. There was surely abun-

dant reason for such attention in the career of Antiochus Epiphanes.

3. The Romans finally gained the ascendancy and compelled Antiochus Epiphanes to evacuate Egypt.

This proves nothing in the case. All the Greek kingdoms were in the end subdued by Rome, but they acted their part just the same.

4. The little horn is called exceeding great in comparison with Persia and Greece, which could not be true in regard to Antiochus Epiphanes.

It is an entirely gratuitous assumption to say that the power represented by the little horn is in the scriptures declared to be "exceeding great" in comparison with any power. The prophet institutes no comparison between the little horn and any other power. It is not called a great horn: it is not even spoken of as a notable horn. On the contrary, it is emphatically described as "a little horn," but is said to have waxed "exceeding great" in three directions which are specified; namely, the south, east, and the pleasant land. This was true of Antiochus Epiphanes, who from a small beginning became great in tyranny and oppression of the Jewish people. On the contrary, Rome was far from being a little power at the time it was first introduced into prophecy. Again, if Rome were the subject of this prophecy, the prophet might have said it waxed great toward the north, and toward the west as well as toward the east, for Rome extended its power in all directions. This is especially true of the popes of Rome, who are held to be included in

this prophecy of the little horn. In the east Rome has lost much, the Greek church and Mohammedanism having taken that portion of the world, but the barbarous tribes of the west of Europe, that broke up the western empire of Rome, were the chief support of the papacy during the middle ages, and still farther west, in the two Americas, the pope has millions of adherents and supporters.

THE DAILY SACRIFICE.

Another feature of this remarkable prophecy must here be considered: The crowning act of impiety of this power was that it took away, or caused to cease, the sacrifices of the Jewish nation which were ordained of God and which were a most solemn and impressive part of his public worship. This Antiochus Epiphanes did, as we have already noted.

Right here those who hold the view that the little horn is a symbol of Rome, oppose by saying that as the word "sacrifice" is not in the original text of Daniel's prophecy, but is a word supplied by the translators, the daily sacrifices of the Jews are not meant, but that something else that goes on every day is referred to. They then contend that the word "daily" means paganism and that the "transgression of desolation" (Dan. 8:13) means Papal Rome.

This is nothing but assumption without a particle of proof. The translators supplied the right word in order to make clear to the readers of English the same idea which the word "daily" alone signified in

the original. The word "daily," by long usage, had come to be the shortened way of reference to the "daily sacrifice." It is somewhat remarkable, to put the case mildly, how persons of no unusual endowments of scholarship deny to the learned men who translated the Scriptures the right to add the word "sacrifice," while at the same time these would-be critics of their own accord cheerfully add the word "desolation."

One writer thus states his view: "The idea of sacrifice does not attach to the word 'daily' at all." —*Thoughts on Daniel*, p. 157.

But pray tell us how the word *desolation* attaches to the word? The word "daily" conveys the idea of *continuity*, and that is the very idea that pertains to the sacrifices. "Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar, two lambs of the first year day by day *continually*." Ex. 29-33. See also Num. 28: 3-10.

It was to be a *continuous* act of national public worship, and its suspension would be a heaven-daring affront to Almighty God. Concerning the word "daily" Gesenius, who is the highest authority on Hebrew text says: "Adjective used as substantive, continual, perpetual, daily, as moving on continually without interruption; *a continual burnt offering or sacrifice; i. e., continued daily both morning and evening.*" Davies in his "Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon" gives the word this definition: "Continuance, burnt offering of continuance, *i. e., continued daily burnt offering.*" Bevan,

a noted Bible scholar, gives the following free translation of the text in question: "How long is the vision to be while the daily sacrifice is taken away and the iniquity set up from the time when he will tread down the sanctuary and the service." Again he says: "Continuance, daily, *stands in Daniel and in the Talmud for the continual daily offering.*"

From these quotations and definitions from eminent authorities (and many more might be added) it is evident that the translators in supplying the word "sacrifice" only gave to the reader of English the same idea that the language of the original conveyed to those who read that language.

NOT A SYMBOL OF TWO POWERS.

The attempt to make the little horn a symbol of the Roman empire and also of the papal church,—a kind of dual symbol and yet one power succeeding the other,—involves those who hold that view in many absurdities. Thus we read: "This little horn must be understood to symbolize Rome in its entire history including its two phases, pagan and papal. . . . In the actions ascribed to this power, sometimes one form is spoken of and sometimes the other. By him (the papal form) the daily (the pagan form) was taken away. Pagan Rome was remodeled into papal Rome, and thus the place of his sanctuary, the city of Rome, was cast down."—*Thoughts on Daniel*, p. 154, 155.

Was there ever such a remarkable juggling of words to make it appear that one horn represents

two powers? Really, separated from the descriptive phrases enclosed in brackets, the writer quoted would have it read thus: By the little horn the power of the little horn was taken away, and the place of the sanctuary of the little horn was cast down!

There is absolutely nothing in the text to prove or suggest that the power under discussion has two phases. This is but a device to make the symbol cover something to which it has no relation whatever. A little more good common sense and not so much freedom taken with personal pronouns and antecedents is a better way of treating this text. The reader will also notice that it is assumed that pagan Rome had a sanctuary located in Rome! But in the same book from which we have already made several quotations the author describing the Jewish sanctuary, says: "This is the only sanctuary *connected with the earth* concerning which the Bible gives us any instruction or history any record." p. 168. How then about that heathen sanctuary in Rome referred to by the same writer on page 155 of same book? The memory of the author of that book must have been at fault there. But we believe that the latter statement is correct, and that both the Bible and history are silent as to any other earthly sanctuary than the Jewish sanctuary.

Then instead of one phase of the little horn trampling down another phase of the same horn,—a most preposterous assumption,—we have the clear and logical statement that the little horn, a unit in its en-

tirety, tramples upon and pollutes the sanctuary of the Jewish people, the sanctuary of Jehovah. This is precisely what Antiochus Epiphanes did.

THE PRINCE OF PRINCES.

It is further urged that Antiochus Epiphanes could not stand up against the Prince of princes since Christ was not then born. But granting that Christ is here referred to, the existence of Christ prior to his incarnation in the flesh and his direction of his people is an accepted doctrine with all Christians. In the days of Joshua he appeared to that leader of Israel as the "captain of the Lord's host." Joshua 5:14. He was just as truly the Prince of princes before as after his incarnation, and any power that rose against his chosen people was opposing him.

THE DEATH OF ANTIOCHUS.

In closing this part of the subject a word upon the tragic death of Antiochus Epiphanes is in order: Learning that the Jews under their renowned leader, Judas Maccabeus, had defeated his army in Palestine and reestablished the sanctuary service, he determined to destroy all the Jewish people. While making a hurried march in that direction, he was seized with a fatal sickness and soon died acknowledging with his last breath that he was being punished for the miseries which he had brought upon the Jewish people. 1 Mac. 6. Thus was fulfilled the prophecy concerning the little horn that he should be broken without hand.

TWO DESOLATING POWERS.

The claim that two desolating powers, paganism and the papacy are predicted in Daniel 8, will now be further considered.

We readily grant that in order to understand the book of Daniel we must recognize the fact that in its prophetic scope it describes two desolating powers, but these are not two phases of the same power. The work accomplished is similar in many respects, though the work of the two may be readily separated and defined. These two powers may be called the Syrian abomination and the Roman abomination. That there was a Syrian abomination the following is proof: "Now upon the fifteenth day of the month Casleu, in the one hundred forty and fifth year they [referring to Antiochus Epiphanes and his followers] set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar and builded idol altars throughout the cities of Judea on every side." This apocryphal scripture is absolute proof that there was a Syrian abomination of desolation, and that it trod down and profaned the sanctuary.

But there was also a Roman abomination referred to in Dan. 9:26, 27: "And for the overspreading of *abominations* he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." Marginal reading: "And upon the battlements shall be the idols of the desolator." This is the abomination which Christ spoke of when long this side of the defiling of the sanctuary by the

Syrians, he said, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, . . . then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." Matt. 24:15.

To recapitulate: The Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes took away the Jewish sacrifices; profaned the sanctuary and trod down the truth of God as then represented by the Jewish people, destroying many thousands of them; magnified himself and practiced and prospered; but from this defilement the sanctuary was cleansed and worship reestablished there by Judas Maccabeus and his brethren within the time specified in this prophecy, as we shall later see. The Romans also polluted the sanctuary and placed there the abomination that maketh desolate, but they did more. "And the people of the prince that shall come shall *destroy* the city and the sanctuary." Dan. 9:26. "And for the overspreading of abomination he shall make it *desolate*, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." Verse 27.

It is worthy of especial notice, in this comparison of these two powers, that in Daniel 9, where Rome is so certainly and conspicuously brought to view there is no charge made that the sacrifices were taken away, but only that the sanctuary was destroyed. This omission to mention the sacrifices in connection with the placing of the Roman abomination when so much stress is laid upon this act when

done by the Syrian king, is readily understood from the fact that the virtue of these sacrifices had ceased when Christ, the great Sacrifice, expired upon the cross, over thirty years before. Then the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom (Matt. 27:51). After that it was a useless service, not worthy of mention.

We must then conclude that from every line of argument bearing on this question Antiochus Epiphanes is symbolized by the little horn of Daniel 8. He took away the Jewish sacrifice, thus for the time suspending the public national act of worship commanded by Almighty God; he established a heathen worship in Jerusalem and throughout the Judean cities; he trod down the sanctuary and desolated the country; he put to death, by many cruel ways of torture, those who held fast to their religion.

THE TWENTY-THREE HUNDRED DAYS.

We now come to a very important, probably the most important, point in the study of this prophecy: Since the prophecy of the little horn relates to the impious acts of the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes, the question regarding the length of the period of desolation also relates to this same power. In other words, the question, "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" (Dan. 8:13), is a question regarding the length of time that Antiochus Epiph-

anes would be allowed to tread down and pollute the sanctuary. And the answer to that question, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed," also relates to that same Syrian king and gives the time of his career against the people of God, and the date of the undoing of his work by the cleansing of the sanctuary and the restoration of the daily sacrifices as commanded in the law of Moses.

Before going farther upon this subject, it is necessary to state, with more minuteness than we have heretofore done, the position taken in reference to this prophecy by those who looked for the coming of Christ and the end of the world in the autumn of the year 1844.

The theory advanced by those zealous but evidently misguided people was that the little horn of Daniel 8 is a symbol of Rome. But as the civil power of Rome expired in the fifth century and as these expositors were anxious to lengthen out the prophetic period so as to make it reach to their own time, it was held that this horn included Rome in its papal as well as its pagan form. That is, that the rule of the popes of Rome was included in the scope of this prophecy. And so the prophetic period was stretched out to cover the time-history of those powers. To do this it was held that the 2,300 days were symbolic of the same number of years. The next effort was to find a starting-point for these years. There is nothing in the eighth chapter of Daniel that gives any clue to

the time of the commencement of this period, and they therefore sought it in the following chapters. Chapter nine contains a vision and prophecy of seventy weeks reaching from a specific point of history to Messiah. Following are the words: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people. . . . Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks." Dan. 9:24, 25.

Beyond question the time of the beginning of the seventy weeks is here given. But that was not what the expositors of the 1844 time theory wanted. They desired an event or point of time for the beginning of the 2,300 days, and as they found none in Daniel, they decided to take the same date as that of the beginning of the seventy weeks!

No other Bible expositors, as far as we know, had up to that time ever held that there was any connection between the 2,300 days of the eighth chapter and the seventy weeks of the ninth chapter. That discovery was left for the late William Miller. His argument was that one definition of the word rendered "determined" (Dan. 9:24) is "to cut off," and he concluded therefore that seventy weeks were cut off from the 2,300 days, and that the seventy weeks were the first part of the 2,300 day period. By this means he tried to make it appear that Christ would come in 1844, which at that time he ardently desired to prove.

The candid reader can but notice that this theory

that the seventy weeks are a part of the 2,300-day period is all pure supposition, and a very unnatural supposition at that. A much more reasonable conjecture would be that the seventy weeks were cut off or separated from all time as the limit of God's forbearance with the chosen people. Or that God "determined" that from the beginning of the period of restoration, which dated from this decree of the Persian king, the Jewish people should have seventy weeks or 490 years of favor. The same word "determined" is also used in verse 27 of the same chapter with precisely the same meaning; that is, something fixed or decreed. The Dutch translation reads "allotted," which exactly brings out the sense.

But having arrived at the conclusion above set forth that the seventy weeks were the first part of the 2,300-days period and that the days would expire in 1844, the next and absorbing question was what would then occur to mark the termination of the days. The text (Dan. 8:14) says nothing of the end of the world, but declares that at the end of the days the sanctuary would be cleansed. These expositors, however, were fully equal to the occasion. Some ambiguous texts that seem to convey the idea that the land of Canaan was the sanctuary were found, and from that attenuated basis they jumped to the most tremendous conclusion that the whole earth would be cleansed by fire in 1844!

The period of the excitement which the preaching of this doctrine caused, we do not care to de-

scribe. Neither men, their motives, nor actions are under discussion in this treatise. We are willing to let the mantle of kindly Christian charity cover them and all their doings, while we concern ourselves with facts which are apparent to all. The Lord did not come; the earth was not cleansed by fire or in any other way.

Soon after the passing of the set time without incident, another theory was advocated: that the sanctuary, referred to in the prophecy (Dan. 8:14), that was to be cleansed at the end of the days, was the sanctuary in heaven, where Christ as the High Priest of the Christian age ministers; that in harmony with its type—the Jewish sanctuary—it would be cleansed once, at the close of Christ's ministration; that this work of cleansing would only occupy a period of time commensurate with the similar work of the Jewish high priest, and that when this cleansing was accomplished the Lord would come. This cleansing was explained to be the work of judgment and the blotting out of the sins of all who had by repentance and faith obtained forgiveness.

At the first, some were inclined to think that as one whole day of the Jewish temple service was devoted to the cleansing of the temple, a proportionate portion of time would be used in the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary; that is, one-three-hundred-and-sixty-fifth part of the whole period of Christ's ministration. Assuming that he entered upon his work as intercessor upon his ascension to heaven A. D. 31,

and changed his ministration from the first to the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, to begin the cleansing of it in 1844, one-three-hundred-and-sixty-fifth part of that time would be between five and six years.

So if Christ should use the same *proportion* of the whole period of the time of his ministration for the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary that was used by the Jewish high priest in the cleansing of the Jewish sanctuary, the work should have been accomplished and Christ should have come before 1850.

Indeed, a very prominent exponent of the theory that Christ began to cleanse the sanctuary in heaven in 1844, and who claims to have the Spirit of Prophecy as the result of visions and revelations from the Lord, about 1850 said:—

“Some are looking too far off for the coming of the Lord. Time has continued a few years longer than they expected, therefore they think it may continue a few years more. . . . I saw that the time for Jesus to be in the most holy place was nearly finished, and that time can not last but very little longer.”—*Early Writings*, p. 49. But according to this theory he has now been engaged in the work of cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary over sixty-three years, or fifty-seven years since the work was “almost finished”! Allowing that his work in both apartments of the sanctuary has been carried forward ever since his ascension, that is, 1872 years, and that since the year A. D. 1844, he has been in the second

apartment cleansing the sanctuary, this cleansing has now occupied over one-thirtieth part of the whole time of his ministration thus far, instead of one-three-hundred-and-sixty-fifth part, as was the case of the Jewish temple. The comparison of the length of time as used by the Jewish high priest in his sanctuary, and that of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is based on the supposition that the Jewish priests actually used the whole of one day in the work of cleansing,—something that can not be proved. Thus upon their own showing the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is not yet accomplished although sixty-three years, or over one-thirtieth part of the time of Christ's whole intercessory work thus far has already been given to what is claimed to be his special and closing work.

It is not the intention of the writer to enter upon any discussion here in regard to the ministration of Christ as our mediator in the heavenly courts; that he acts in that capacity, we have no doubt, but we have very serious doubts that he goes through all the sprinklings, washings, and various maneuvers performed by the Jewish priests, or that he moves around from place to place during his ministration. Such performances would seem puerile and unnecessary. That Christ, upon his ascension, went into the holiest of all and into the very presence of God, is susceptible of the clearest proof. See Hebrews 1:3; 6:19, 20; 10:12, 19; 12:2; Acts 2:33; Rev. 3:21. In studying the work of Christ, compared with the Jewish types, it would be well for us to remember

the words of Paul, that the shadow of the good things to come is "not the very image of the things." Heb. 10:1.

Another unexplainable feature of the 2,300-day theory is that while this period is alleged to cover a time that a desolating power, claimed to be Rome, is treading down the people of God, the beginning of this period is placed 457 years before Christ, under the reign of a benevolent Persian king, centuries before Rome, or even Greece, which preceded Rome, came into the field of prophecy.

More than that: according to this theory the period of desolation dates from a decree of the Persian king, at that time the greatest monarch in the world, for the *restoration* of the temple and its services, a restoration which was actually carried out and which, with the exception of the interruption accomplished by Antiochus Epiphanes, lasted until the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in A. D. 70.

It is therefore incumbent on those who hold this theory to tell in what way Rome trod down the sanctuary and the host during the three centuries in which it had no connection with the Jewish people or authority of any kind over the land of the sanctuary.

And as this little horn power was to tread down the sanctuary and the host during the whole of the 2,300-day period, and as the Mohammedan powers have held possession of the land of the sanctuary since A. D. 837, those who hold this view must also tell in what way Rome has trodden down the sanctuary since

it passed out from under Roman power? And since the treading down of the host and the sanctuary was to cease at the close of the period, claimed to end in 1844, they must also inform us in what way there has been any cessation of the treading down of the sanctuary and of the host since 1844. Their theory will not allow of any satisfactory answer to these very natural and pertinent queries.

A theory that causes such sad and tremendous disappointments and that is permeated with such far-fetched and illogical conclusions carries in itself the proof that it is radically wrong.

We therefore entirely discard the theory that Rome in any form whatever is represented by the little horn of Daniel 8, and take the more rational view that the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes is meant, evidence of which we have abundantly supplied.

NOT TWENTY-THREE HUNDRED YEARS.

Attention will now be called to the study of the prophetic period as a literal rather than a symbolic prophecy. And in order to bring it once more forcibly and clearly before the reader, another quotation of the text is here given: "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the

sanctuary be cleansed." Dan. 8:13, 14. Really the question is this: How long shall this desolating power tread down the people of God and defile the sanctuary of Jehovah? and the reply is, that this desolation shall continue for twenty-three hundred days, and at the end of that period of time the sanctuary will be cleansed from its pollution.

Thus far, for the sake of convenience and facility of expression, we have referred to this prophetic period as the 2,300 days, but now, in the interests of truthful exposition, it is absolutely necessary to state that there is no such prophetic period as the 2,300 *days*. If the reader will look at the marginal reading of this text, it will be found to read thus: "Unto twenty-three hundred evening morning then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The translators here put the word "day" in the place of evening morning, but these are left in the margin. This is *not* a case where a word or words are added to bring out the sense. The words "evening morning" are entirely omitted. These words are as well understood as any other words. Every one knows what the evening is, and what the morning is. The morning is the first part of the day, the evening, the last part. We say "Good morning" until noon; after that we say "Good evening." This expression is a very peculiar one. There must, therefore, be a good and sufficient reason for its use here. If the Lord had wanted to convey the idea of "days," he certainly would not have said "evening morning." This vision is specifically

referred to as "The vision of the evening and the morning." Dan. 8:26. Not that the vision was given in the evening or in the morning, but it had reference to something that was done evening and morning. Hence the expression, "Unto two thousand three hundred evening morning." To ascertain what was done, we have only to study the work of the little horn: "By him the daily sacrifice was taken away." Dan. 8:11. This was the crowning act of impiety and wickedness perpetrated by Antiochus Epiphanes. At what time were these sacrifices offered?—Every evening and every morning. "Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar; two lambs of the first year, day by day continually. The one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning; and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even." Ex. 29:38, 39. Then it is apparent that the continuance of this power over the people of God for 2,300 evening mornings would mean just that same number of sacrifices interrupted or prevented. And it is also equally apparent that since there were two sacrifices offered each day, one in the morning and one in the evening, the desolation and treading down of the sanctuary would last *just half as many days* as there were evening mornings. We do not question the fact that sometimes a day in prophecy represents a year, but in this case even the word "day" is not in the original, as has been seen.

Another point must now be considered. There is no absolute agreement of the various versions of the scriptures as to the number of these evening morn-

ings. Our version, and probably the majority of the versions, makes it twenty-three hundred. The Vatican copy of the Septuagint reads twenty-four hundred. "The answer made to this question was, unto two thousand three hundred days, or as the LXX reads, twenty-four hundred days. Or as certain copies mentioned by Jerome read, "twenty-two hundred days."—*Scott's Commentary* on Daniel 8. What versions they were that give the period as 2,200 days, we have not as yet learned. But as they were referred to by the learned Jerome, who lived in the fourth century, they must have been among the earliest or oldest copies. As we look at this matter, it makes little practical difference which one of these versions is correct, since a proper understanding of the prophecy makes it clear that it does not greatly concern us, but it is well to know the truth of the matter, so as to avoid a false and misleading explanation.

No one now contends for absolute verbal inspiration and infallibility of all the WORDS in any translation of the Scriptures. None of the first MSS. are now in existence; and undoubtedly many copies of the older MSS. of the Old Testament were lost or destroyed before the oldest now in existence were taken. Thus there are slight variations between the different versions which in no way detracts from their validity. As to the point under discussion,—the number of days, or rather evening mornings,—there is only one way to ascertain which one, if any, of these periods, the 2,200, 2,300, or 2,400, is right. Find the

exact time when the daily sacrifice was taken away and the abomination of desolation set up. Then ascertain, if possible, when that abomination of desolation was taken away, the sanctuary cleansed of its defilement, and the worship of the true God resumed by the offering again of the daily sacrifices, that were commanded as the national act of worship of his chosen people. If the time so ascertained shall agree with any one of these periods, this agreement would be proof as strong as Holy Writ that that period is the right one.

A REMARKABLE FULFILMENT.

The attention of the reader is now invited to the first book of Maccabees. No one can deny that this apocryphal scripture is good history, nor can it be proved that it is not as truly inspired as the book of Daniel. The Jewish people have always held these apocryphal writings in the highest estimation. The text to which we will refer to find the exact date of the cessation of the Jewish sacrifice and the setting up of the abomination of desolation has been quoted before in this treatise, but will now be quoted again: "Now the fifteenth day of the month Casleu on the one hundred and forty and fifth year they [Antiochus Epiphanes and his hosts] set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar and builded idol altars throughout the cities of Judea on every side." 1 Mac. 1:54. Of the suspension of the daily sacrifices, read the following: "*A stop was put to both morning and*

evening sacrifices, not one of the servants of the true God daring to come and adore Him there.”—*Rollin's History*, Book 18, p. 13. Of the defilement of the sanctuary, the following testimony is offered: “This monarch [Antiochus Epiphanes] was one of the most cruel, rapacious, and tyrannical princes that ever achieved infamous immortality. He vented his wrath upon the Jews as though he were mad [crazy]. Onias III was high priest at that time. Antiochus dispossessed him of his great office and gave it to his brother, a Hellenized Jew, who erected in Jerusalem a gymnasium after the Greek style. But the king, a zealot in paganism, bitterly and scornfully detested the Jewish religion, and resolved to root it out. His general, Appollonius, had orders to massacre the people in the observance of their rites; to abolish the temple services, and the Sabbath, to destroy the sacred books and to introduce idol worship. The altar on Mount Moriah was especially desecrated and afterwards dedicated to Jupiter. A herd of swine were driven into the temple and there sacrificed; this outrage was to the Jews ‘the abomination of desolation’ which could never be forgotten or forgiven.”—*Jewish Heroes*, by John Lord.

Another well-known historian makes the following statement: “The conqueror [Antiochus Epiphanes] marched without delay against Jerusalem, put to death in three days’ time 40,000 of the inhabitants and seized as many more to be sold as slaves. . . . He entered every court of the temple, pillaged the treasury, seized

the sacred utensils and the golden candlesticks, the table of shewbread, the altar of incense, and thus collected a booty to the amount of 1,800 talents. He then commanded a great sow to be sacrificed upon the altar of burnt offering, part of the flesh to be boiled, and the liquor of the unclean animal sprinkled upon every part of the temple, and thus desecrated with the most defilement the sacred place the Jews had considered for centuries the one holy spot in the universe.”—*Milman's Works*, Book 9, pp. 506, 507.

After reading the foregoing statements, can any one doubt that the sanctuary was polluted, or that this impious act of defilement and the subsequent cleansing of the holy place should be made a matter of earnest inquiry and explanation? Much more evidence upon this point might be adduced.

In this extremity, the Jewish cities desolated, their sanctuary trodden down and polluted, their national acts of worship prevented, and a large number of the Jews becoming the open and avowed adherents of Antiochus and his pagan worship, the Lord raised up a mighty deliverer in the person of Judas Maccabeus.

If the reader has never read the first book of the Maccabees, he should do so at the first opportunity. After reading, he will be ready to agree with the following statement:—

“After the heroic deeds of Joshua, Gideon, and David, no warriors appeared in Jewish history equal to Judas Maccabeus and his brothers in bravery, in patriotism, and in noble deeds. They delivered the

Hebrew nation when it had sunk into abject submission, under the kings of Syria, and when its glory and strength alike had departed. . . . No hero that chivalry had produced surpassed him in courage and ability; his exploits would be fabulous and incredible if not so well attested. He is not a familiar character, since the apocrypha, from which our chief knowledge of him and his deeds is derived, now rarely are read." *"Jewish Heroes,"* by John Lord, p. 429. Of the war waged by this Jewish hero for the delivery of his people and the recovery and purification of the temple, it is only necessary to describe the final results that mark the fulfilment of the prophecy under consideration. Describing the gathering of his small army, Rollin says: "He [Judas] made much use of this place (Maspha) because as Jerusalem was in the hands of their enemies, and the *sanctuary trampled* upon, they could not assemble in it to solemnize that religious act." Book 18, p. 137.

After the signal defeat of the Syrians by Judas and his small band of heroes, the first act of the victors was to cleanse the defiled temple and restore the sacrifices. The Syrians still held the strong military tower of the city, but Judas did not wait for victory over this force. "Judas took precautions to keep a body of armed men upon the watch against the Syrian garrison in the citadel and then proceeded to install the most blameless of the priests in their office; to repair the sacred edifice, to purify every part from the profanation of the heathen, to construct a new

altar, to replace out of the booty all of the sacred vessels, and at length to celebrate a feast of dedication, a period of eight days,—which ever after was held sacred in the Jewish calendar.”—*Milman's Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 14, 15.

Another historian has given the following graphic description of the cleansing and the dedication of the sanctuary:—

“Judas had now leisure to cleanse the sanctuary and dedicate it. . . . He pulled down the defiled altar of burnt offering and rebuilt it. *Cleansed the sanctuary*, hallowed the desecrated courts, made new holy vessels, decked the front of the temple with crowns and shields of gold. . . . When all was cleansed and renewed, a solemn service of reconsecration was celebrated; the sacred fire was kindled on the altar, thousands of lamps were lighted, the sacrifices were offered, and the people thronged the courts of Jehovah, and with psalms of praise, festive dances, harps, lutes, and cymbals made a joyful noise unto the Lord. It was forever after, as long as the temple stood, held a sacred yearly festival and called the Feast of Dedication.”—*Jewish Heroes*, by John Lord, p. 452.

Read also the following from a Jewish historian:

“The work of restoration was carried on with such ardor that the inauguration of the temple could take place on the 25th of Kisleu, the self-same day on which, three years before, Antiochus had the worship to cease, and had defiled the temple by dedicating

it to Jupiter Olympus. This anniversary of a profanation predicted centuries before as the 'abomination of desolation' (Dan. 11:31), but from which the Lord had now vouchsafed, with 'a strong hand and outstretched arm,' to cleanse his altar and his sanctuary, so that the day had indeed been changed 'from sorrow to joy, from mourning into feasting,'—this anniversary now so glorious was ushered in with all imaginable solemnity. At the earliest dawn, the priests' trumpets were sounded; a new fire was kindled by the striking of two fire-stones, and as soon as the flames ascended to heaven, the lamb of the daily sacrifice was offered, the lamps were lighted, the usual portion of incense was burned, and every other part of the divine service performed according to the law of Moses; and from that day it was not again discontinued until the last siege of Jerusalem by Titus."—*Post-Biblical History of the Jews*, by Raphael, Vol. 1, pp. 262, 263.

Can any person of a candid mind read the foregoing and fail to see that the career of Antiochus Epiphanes, his destruction of the mighty and holy people, the profanation of the temple which he accomplished, his final defeat, tragic death, and the cleansing and rededication of the sanctuary, and the restoration of the worship of God in the place and way he appointed is the fulfilment of the prophecy of Daniel 8?

Here was a pollution of the sanctuary that all can understand. No fancy is required to grasp the idea. It was a real pollution, testified to by many reputable

witnesses, and described by writers of both sacred and common history. The same is true of the cleansing. It was no idealistic figment of the imagination, but a real transaction, vouched for by reputable historians in as clear and veracious a manner as any event of history. The sanctuary was polluted and trodden down; it was also cleansed of its pollution and rededicated to the worship and service of God, according to the prophecy.

But the most important statement in reference to this cleansing is yet to come. We have reserved it to the last because it is the original description, as given in the apocrypha, and especially as it gives the *date* of the cleansing—the crucial test of the prophetic period that covers the time of the desolation of the temple and the suspension of the daily sacrifices: “Then said Judas to his brethren, Behold our enemies are discomfited; let us go up to cleanse and dedicate the sanctuary. . . . So he chose priests of blameless conversation, such as had pleasure in the law, *who cleansed the sanctuary* and bare out the defiled stones into an unclean place. Now on the five and twentieth day of the ninth month (which is called the month Casleu) in the hundred forty eighth year, they rose up betimes in the morning and offered sacrifices according to the law upon the new altar of burnt offering, which they had made. Look at what time, and what day the heathen had profaned it, even in that was it dedicated with songs, and citherns, and harps, and cymbals. Moreover, Judas and his breth-

ren with the whole congregation of Israel ordained that the days of the dedication of the altar should be kept in their season from year to year by the space of eight days, from the five and twentieth day of the month Casleu, with mirth and gladness." 1 Mac. 4: 43, 52-56, 59.

This is the feast of dedication referred to in John 10: 22.

Let us now give close attention to the length of time between the desecration and the cleansing of the sanctuary as here described.

It is plainly stated that the abomination of desolation was set up on the fifteenth day of the month Casleu in the one hundred and forty-fifth year.

Casleu is the ninth month of the year, as may be seen by consulting any Jewish table of months, and as it is plainly said to be in the description of the cleansing at the end of the period of desolation. The cleansing took place on the 25th day of the 148th year. From the 15th day of Casleu on the 145th year to the 15th day of Casleu on the 148th year there would be 37 months, which at $29\frac{1}{2}$ days to a month would amount to 1,091 days. Add to this the 10 days from the 15th day of Casleu to the 25th day, when the sanctuary was cleansed, would make the whole time 1,100 days, completing the period of desolation and treading down and marking the day of cleansing.

Eleven hundred days, and two sacrifices a day, would exactly harmonize with the 2,200 evening-

morning period, and marks the readings that give that length of time as the right ones. And certainly there would not be one chance in a million that the number of days between these two events, the desecration and the cleansing of the sanctuary, would come out right to a day with any one of these periods, the 2,200, 2,300, or the 2,400, unless it were the right period. This explanation amounts therefore to a demonstration; no other explanation that has ever been offered does. If it had been in harmony with the time as given in our version, it would have been no better or clearer. We challenge any student of the prophetic Word to find another prophecy in the Scriptures that has had a more remarkable and absolutely accurate fulfilment; and we may well join with the angel in exclaiming, "And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true." Dan. 8:26.

Notice, too, the striking manner in which attention is called to the day and date of the cleansing: "Look at what time and what day the heathen had profaned it." Why notice the time unless somewhere God in his Word had foretold the work of this evil power, and had stated the time of its continuance.

Right here we wish to make a very interesting and important quotation from the great Jewish historian, Josephus:—

"Daniel wrote that he saw these visions in the plain of Susa, and he hath informed us, that God interpreted the appearance of the vision after the following manner: He said that the ram signified the

kingdom of the Medes and Persians, and the horns those kings that were to reign in them; and the last horn signified the last king, and that he should exceed all kings in riches and glory; that the he-goat signified that one should come and reign from the Greeks who would twice fight with the Persians and overcome him in battle, and should receive his entire dominion: that by the great horn which sprang out of the head of the he-goat was meant the first king; and the springing up of four horns upon its falling off, and the conversion of every one of them to four quarters of the earth signified the successors that should arise after the death of the first king and the partition of the kingdom among them, and that they should be neither his children or his kindred, that they should reign over the habitable earth for many years; and that from among them should arise a certain king, that should overcome our nation and our laws, and he should take away our political government and spoil the temple, and forbid the sacrifice for three years' time. And indeed it so came to pass that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes according to Daniel's vision and what he wrote many years before it came to pass."—*Antiquities of the Jews*, Book, 10, pp. 199, 200.

From this statement several important deductions may be clearly drawn:

1. Josephus believed that Antiochus Epiphanes was symbolized by the little horn of Daniel 8.
2. That the prophetic period of that chapter gave

the length of the period of desolation that Antiochus brought upon the Jewish people.

3. That he did not believe that period was one of many hundreds of years.

4. That he did not believe it was a period of time as long as 2,300 literal days; for he said it was only three years, and 2,300 literal days would be over six years.

5. He must therefore have computed the time by the number of sacrifices prevented; that is, by evening mornings, an evening and a morning for each day.

One further statement in reference to this time period: If we allow that the evening mornings represent days, and the days represent years, and that they commenced B. C. 457, we are now nearer the end of the 2,400-day period than we are to the end of the 2,300-day period. That is to say, we are now nearer to A. D. 1944 than we are to A. D. 1844, having passed the half-way mark in A. D. 1894. We are therefore not surprised to learn that some persons have already transferred their faith to the 1944 date, and are now looking forward to A. D. 1944 with the same anticipation that their fathers in faith looked for the end of the 2,300 days and the coming of the Lord in A. D. 1844, for—

“Error cherished long, e’en when confessed,
With deep reluctance leaves the human breast.”

CLEANSING OF THE HOLY PLACE.

But there may be those who have so strongly imbibed the idea that the sanctuary in heaven must be cleansed that they may still feel that even if the cleansing of the sanctuary referred to in Daniel 8 was the earthly sanctuary, and that that cleansing is past, still the sanctuary in heaven must at some time be cleansed.

As our effort is to assist all who have held this erroneous view to see the mistake into which they have been drawn, it seems proper to give more especial attention to the work of Christ as related to the heavenly places.

As a sacrifice for sin, Christ was the antitype of the sacrificial offerings ordained by the law of Moses. But it would not be proper for us to claim that in the treatment he received previous to his death, or in the manner of his death, there was to be an *exact parallel* with the sacrifices that prefigured his sacrifice. It is enough that in a broad and general sense he was a sacrifice for our sins.

The same principle holds true in regard to his mediatorial work. No person can really believe that he will do all things that the priests of old did; nor is it necessary to believe that he will minister for a certain length of time in one apartment of the sanctuary in heaven, and then in another. "Heaven itself" is said to be the place of his ministry, and the texts which prove that upon his ascension to heaven he went immediately into the very presence of God,

have already been cited and need not be referred to again.

The attention of the reader is now invited to the book of Hebrews, and especially to the texts that are claimed to prove that the heavenly sanctuary will be cleansed. "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people. The Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." Heb. 9:6-8.

In the above quoted words the work of the Jewish high priest on the day of atonement is referred to, but *not to say* that Christ would cleanse the sanctuary in heaven, but *only* to say that that act signified that the way into the holiest of all—heaven—was not then manifest. In other words, that the God-man, Christ Jesus, would enter heaven itself as our mediator, was not then manifest or understood, and that was what that act of the high priest signified. Now however, knowing it, we can "enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." Verse 19.

"But," says one, "is it not stated that it is necessary that the heavenly things must be purified?"—Yes, but this was not a cleansing from sin. There is no such statement in the Scripture anywhere or anything equivalent thereto. A fatal mistake in Scrip-

ture exposition has been made in thinking that the purification of the heavenly things referred to in Heb. 9:24, is the antitype of the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary on the great day of atonement as described in Lev. 16:19.

A careful study of Heb. 9:24 with context will make it apparent to every candid person that no reference is there made to the work of the Jewish high priest on the day of atonement. The comparison is not between the high priest and Christ, but between the work of Moses and that of Christ as it is in other places in the same book; and the work described is not the cleansing of the sanctuary from sin, *for Moses never cleansed the sanctuary*, but it is the ratification of the covenant and the dedication of the sanctuary by Moses before the services in that earthly sanctuary could begin. Thus we read: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God enjoined unto you. Moreover, he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary [referring to the work of Moses] that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not

entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. 9: 18-24.

Please study this scripture carefully. The dedication or purification of the sanctuary by Moses and the better things that Christ does is the topic. The blood of calves and water was used with the blood of goats, but on the day of atonement the blood of only one goat was taken into the sanctuary, or used in any way for the cleansing. On the day of atonement the priest took the blood of the goat and put it upon the horns of the altar and sprinkled it upon the altar seven times (Lev. 16: 18, 19). But in the comparison in Heb. 9: 24, Moses sprinkled all the vessels of the ministry, the book of the covenant, all the people and the tabernacle itself, and dedicated it. So Christ, when he entered the "holiest" in heaven, dedicated it, or purified it by his own blood. *It was all done when he entered it.* There he is now in the presence of God as our mediator, and there has been no change in his ministration since he first entered it.

Notice particularly that the Apostle refers to this work of Moses as a dedication (verse 18); and that the word here translated "dedicated" is from the same Greek word that in Heb. 10: 20 is translated "consecrated." This is absolute proof that the dedication or consecration of the heavenly places by Christ's blood and presence there is what the apostle is considering, and that the purification referred to by the apostle as

typical of Christ's work was the ceremonial purification incident to the dedication of the sanctuary by Moses, and not the annual cleansing of the sanctuary as accomplished by the Jewish high priest. The heavenly places were purified or dedicated when Christ entered them; they will never need to be cleansed from sin, and there is no scripture stating that such a cleansing of the heavenly places will ever occur.

A FRAGILE BASIS.

In closing, a few more remarks in regard to the 1844 time theory may be ventured:

The theory rests upon a frail basis of suppositions and assumptions not one of which is susceptible of absolute proof or demonstration.

1. It is assumed that the little horn of Daniel 8 is (a) symbolic of the civil and military power of Rome, (b) and also of the Roman Catholic Church as represented by the popes.

2. It is assumed that the ninth chapter of Daniel is subsidiary to, and an explanation of, the eighth chapter.

3. It is assumed that the "evening mornings" mean days.

4. It is further assumed that each day stands for, or represents, a year.

5. It is assumed that the seventy weeks of Daniel 9 are cut off from the 2,300 days.

6. It is assumed that the 2,300 days began where the seventy weeks are said to begin—B. c. 457.

7. It *was* assumed that the sanctuary to be cleansed at the end of the period was the whole earth.

8. And now it is assumed that the sanctuary to be cleansed is in heaven and that though sixty-three years of time have passed since that work began, still the cleansing is not yet finished.

Were there ever such remarkable calculations and tremendous conclusions based upon so weak, fallacious grounds? If a chain is no stronger than its weakest link, what should be said of a chain of evidence every link of which is faulty? Is it any wonder that, at the time when the period was supposed to close, nothing whatever occurred; that the sun rose and set as usual, and all the operations of nature went on as before?

Of the men who made these fallacious, speculative calculations, and who are, to say the least, measurably responsible for the consequences, we have nothing to say. Their honesty we do not question. How much their judgment was biased and warped by their very strong desires, no man can tell. That must be left for a higher power than man to decide, and surely the Judge of all the earth will do right. Nor do we desire by what is here written to cast any aspersion or slur upon any church or upon any individuals who may help to compose such church that has held and promulgated such views. But we wish to call attention to the certainty that their calculations are wrong; and the longer a church clings to any false theory

the more certain and disastrous will be the final consequences.

Finally, the writer would say for himself that no personal pique or desire for any gain or notoriety of any kind has prompted him in this work. *It is as painful for him as it can possibly be for any other person.* He would be exceedingly glad to believe all that he was early taught was the truth upon the subject herein presented. There is no people, as a whole, that he loves as he does that people who still believe this theory. All his early associations and the mature years of his manhood were spent in closest labor and harmony with them, and nothing that is here said should be construed as a denial of the great Biblical truth that Christ will return to earth, or that that return is an event not far in the future. But sometimes the thought lies heavily upon the writer's heart that not only the setting of time for the coming of the Lord, but even for the beginning of some unseen work in heaven, supposed to be preparatory for that coming, by over-zealous believers, has caused much more harm than good,—actually resulting in unbelief in that which should be firmly believed by all Christians. For because of it the great truth of the coming of the Lord has thus been seen by many only through the dim fog caused by wild and unnecessary speculations followed by deferred and blasted hopes and most bitter disappointment.

To expect that all who have heretofore believed the theory here controverted, will upon reading this

treatise, at once openly renounce their former belief in the 1844 time theory, in which is bound up so many years of faith and faith's activities, would doubtless be expecting too much; but we do believe that the positions herein taken are so clear and the proofs so convincing that it will be studied with the serious attention that so important a subject demands, and that it will have the effect, sooner or later, of changing the minds of many persons,—eventually leading them away from wild speculations and fanciful interpretations of scripture to the solid ground of truth, historic fact, reason, and enlightened common sense.

